

THE HISTORY OF FOREIGN RULE IN ANCIENT INDIA

BY

K. C. OJHA, M.A., LL.B., D.Phil.

University of Allahabad

GYAN PRAKASHAN

ALLAHABAD

1968

Published by
Gyan Prakashan
91 Old Bairana
Allahabad—3

First Edition 1968

Printed by
R. N. Bhargava
At the Standard Press
Allahabad

PREFACE

It is a well-known fact that there are no historical works of ancient India giving even the barest outlines of her history. All attempts at writing this history have been made only in modern times by piecing together bits of information coming from various sources. These bits have come and are still coming to our knowledge day by day. So almost every day we not only have to go on collecting additional information on particular points of ancient Indian history but at times, on discovery of mass of fresh information, also have to revise the very basic structure of this history.

To give a precise date the beginning of a systematic study of ancient Indian history may be placed in 1784 with the foundation of the Royal Asiatic Society. Some sixty years after this event took place, in 1839 Elphinstone published his famous 'History of India'. Observing that "no connected relation of the national transactions can be attempted until after the Mahomedan conquest," Elphinstone gave for the ancient period of Indian history only an outline of its culture.

But after the passage of some sixty more years since the publication of Elphinstone's book, in 1904 Vincent Smith was in a position to say that "The researches of a multitude of scholars working in various fields have disclosed an unexpected wealth of materials for the reconstruction of ancient Indian history; and the necessary preliminary studies of a technical kind have been carried so far that the moment seems to have arrived for taking stock of the accumulated stores of knowledge. It now appears to be practicable to exhibit the results of antiquarian studies in the shape of a 'connected relation', not less intelligible to the ordinary educated reader than Elphinstone's narrative of the transactions of the Muhammedan period". In 'The Early History of India' published the same year, Vincent Smith did provide a

narrative of ancient Indian history. In his own words, "strictly speaking, this work is in substance an attempt to present in narrative form the history of the ancient dominant dynasties of Northern India". All our present works on the history of ancient India published upto this time follow the pattern set by Smith's classic work.

Now, since the publication of this work, some sixty more years have passed. Along with them our knowledge of ancient India has advanced much further. So much so that it has necessitated a revision of the very framework of ancient Indian history proposed by Vincent Smith.

The history of a nation is not the narrative of its principal dynasties as thought by Vincent Smith and his contemporaries. This history must analyse the forces which have worked for making up the nation. Up-to-date information indicates that, as in the medieval and modern periods so in the ancient period also, India grew under the pressure of certain foreign peoples who one after another occupied large parts of her territories. The different stages of the ancient Indian history, like those of the medieval and modern Indian histories, have to be arranged in the order of her invaders. The history of each stage has to be studied in the background of the history of the conqueror who dominated India during that stage. The present work seeks to survey the early history of India in this perspective leaving aside the cultural history. The growth of culture can be rightly judged only after the essential political substructure has been settled.

Some material of this book has been taken from the author's thesis for D. Phil. degree approved in the Allahabad University in 1956. The author craves the indulgence of the readers for numerous mistakes in the book printed carelessly from a rough draft.

February, 1968 K. C. OJHA

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AMMK	Ārya Manjus'rī-Mūla-Kalpa
ASI, AR	Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report
BMC	British Museum Catalogue
CHI	Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Ancient India
CII	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum
Divy.	Divyāvadāna
PTDKA	Purāna Text of the Dynasties of Kali Age
EHI	Early History of India by V. A. Smith
EI	Epigraphica Indica
EECA	Early Empires of Central Asia by W.M. McGovern
GBI	The Greeks in Bactria and India by W. W. Tarn
IHQ	The Indian Historical Quarterly
Ind. Arch.	Indian Archaeology
IA	Indian Antiquary
IMC	Indian Museum Catalogue of Coins
JA	Journal Asiatique
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JASB	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
JBORS	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society
JGJRI	Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute
JNSI	Journal of the Numismatic Society of India
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
MASI	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India
NC	Numismatic Chronicle
OP	Old Persian by G. Kent
PMC	Punjab Museum Catalogue of Coins

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For a proper understanding of the ancient history of India in its true perspective, it is necessary to bear certain facts in mind.

1. GEOGRAPHICAL FACTORS

First of all we have to take account of a few of the most important geographical factors which have determined the course of ancient Indian history.

Exchange of ideas and techniques is an essential requirement for the advancement of civilization. In the ancient world such exchange was confined to a few countries situated in the area of mutual communication of the time. They comprised China, central and western Asia, northern Africa, and *south-eastern Europe. India was not in this* area. However, it was connected with it.

Afghanistan and Iran, lying in the middle of this area, were constantly occupied by empire-builders and migrants from all sides. From these countries many passes and river-valleys gave access over low mountains to the Indus valley; and from the latter to the Gangetic basin, and western as well as southern India. In this way, through Afghanistan and Iran, India received regularly conquerors and migrants from the whole of the ancient world, from China in the east to Europe in the west. As in other countries of the ancient world, so in India, these conquerors and migrants, carrying with themselves the civilization of their native lands, provided stimulus for the growth of civilization in the places of their arrival.

India is a huge country under hard sun covered by great mountains, large rivers, vast, fertile plains, and immense forests. These plains, divided from one another by mountains, rivers and forests, have been peopled from times immemorial by teeming millions of diverse races and languages, welded together in a strong social system. Howsoever numerous the foreigners coming to India over long, narrow passages might have been, they could hardly change wholesale the vast population and almost unchanging social system of this country. On the other hand, in the long run these foreigners themselves, enervated by the hard sun, were submerged among the countless natives beyond recognition. Similarly, howsoever advantageous position these victorious foreigners might have occupied in the Indian society of their time, and howsoever superior their civilization might have been, they could hardly reverse the mighty and stagnant current of Indian culture. They could only supply new colours and contents to it, which would become hard to notice in the long run.

Thus, although isolated from the rest of the world by high mountains and deep seas, India has continuously got foreigners' impacts through the north-western passes which, although not breaking the flow of Indian population and culture, have given impetus to the development of Indian civilization.

The western border of India giving access to the interior regions of the country from all parts of the ancient world on so many points, is mountainous, dry and very extensive. In ancient times it was very difficult for any power to guard it all against persistent invaders. Only strong and united inner India could put a check on their advance. But inner India itself, being a whole sub-continent, divided strongly in several parts by Nature, was hardly susceptible to strict control of any one authority in ancient times. Hence their could be no check on foreigners in coming to and settling

in one or the other part of it. Even the vanquished peoples of east Iran and Afghanistan, expelled from their home-lands from time to time, have always occupied parts of this country without much difficulty. Most of the foreign invaders of India are such refugee-conquerors. Peoples coming from other parts of the world have always settled first of all in Iran and Afghanistan. (The displaced Iranians and Afghans have occupied the Indus valley, and the inhabitants of this valley have fled successively to north, west and south India.) This frequently occurring chain of action and reaction is the key of the medieval and ancient history of India with its nerve centre in the western passes.[1]

A leading political geographer of India, who is an authority on the north-western Indian border-lands, has rightly summarised the political geography of India in these words, "In no country in the world has geographical position relatively to surrounding continents and seas shaped the history and the destinies of a people more surely than in India. A land of promise, where Nature offers her gifts with lavish hand, and where the soil is peculiarly favourable to the reproduction of mankind, yet forming a sort of geographical cul-de-sac with a few notable gateways leading thereto from the north, and no exist, except by sea, to the east, south or west, India has been from time immemorial held by immigrants who have multiplied within her borders with such prodigious vitality that no recent wave of conquest sweeping through her historic gates has made any permanent impression, whilst each in turn has added something to her perplexing ethnography (and culture)."[2]

1. Cf. J. F. Richards, Geographic Factors in Indian Archaeology, IA, 1933.

2. T. H. Holdich, India, p. 1.

2. ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Ancient India, as known from the unimpeachable evidence of archaeological material, was dominated by the foreigners. Her history, rather pre-history, begins some one million years ago with the Old Stone Age. Even during this remote Age she appears to have received the hand axe people from the north-west and the chopper-chopping-tools-bearing people from the north-east. The Old Stone Age, lingering for an unusually long time all over the country, reveals the stagnant character of Indian culture from the very start. Showing no signs of natural evolution, this Age seems to have developed suddenly in the Microlithic Era, lasting right upto the historical times in many parts of India, perhaps only with the arrival of a new people again from the north-west. Monotonous Indus Valley Civilization has already been giving indications of its origin in Iran, Baluchistan and still more western countries. The Aryans, *whose culture and literature persists even to-day in India,* are well known to have entered into India from the north-west.

In the historical period the Mauryan monuments, scattered all over the country, bear the stamp of Perso-Greek artists. From the second century B. C. upto the end of the ancient period the whole of western India is full of the coins and inscriptions of alien rulers. The post-Mauryan indigenous dynasties of India known from the Purāṇas—the Sātavāhanas, the Kaṇvas and the Śuṅgas—have left their coins and *inscriptions only in the mid-Indian mountainous regions from* Besnagar to Nāsik. The Hāthīgumphā inscription of king Khāravela indicates that during this period the Gangetic basin was left to the foreigners (Yavanas). From their coins and inscriptions the Kushāṇas are definitely known to have occupied the whole of northern India. After the Kushāṇas this region passed under the Guptas. But the Guptas were replaced by the alien Hūṇas *whose inscriptions come from*

the places situated in the very heart of this land, Eraṇa and Kauśāmbī. Later on these Hūṇas appear as Rājputs to dominate the whole of India till the medieval times.)

3. LEGENDARY HISTORY

It is only from the time of Aśoka in the third century B. C. that we begin to get reliable archaeological material for knowing definitely at least the main outlines of ancient Indian history. The historians of Alexander throw some light even on the history of the last quarter of the fourth century B. C. But for the history of the still earlier period we get no reliable source of information. Archaeology can present us only a cultural time-table from the Indus Valley Civilization onwards.

Nevertheless from the time of the composition of the earliest hymns of Rigveda, the Indians have continuously produced a vast literature which is still available. But the whole of this literature is entirely devoted to religion. In the name of history (Purāṇa) also, it gives numerous religious legends dealing with the gods and mythological personalities. Deep down the legends, there appear some lists of kings of ancient India. (The last of these kings, corroborated by archaeological evidences, are, no doubt, historical; but the earliest of them clearly appear to be mythological.) History has been inextricably mixed up here with mythology; and there is hardly any means to rescue it now.

Besides the Purāṇas, certain Buddhist as well as Jain works also give the lists of ancient Indian kings in the same way under a huge mass of legends. Some of these kings, mentioned as contemporaries of Buddha and Mahāvīra, are common in all the three lists. On this ground these kings are generally thought to be historical without any other corroborative evidence, although the occurrence of the names of these kings in all the lists may be due simply to the fact that the lists originate from a common source. Even the dating

of these kings in the sixth century B.C. is not perfectly certain as the date of Buddha himself, on which it rests, is yet really only 'a working hypothesis.'[1] At any rate description of the social, economic and religious conditions of the time of these kings on the basis of the early Buddhist literature of undefined space and time is altogether unjustifiable. Great scholars like T. W. Rhys Davids and R. Fick, never utilised this literature for this purpose. They use this literature only to show that ancient India of one time, not definitely that of the sixth century B. C., known from this literature, which may be termed 'Buddhist India', is somewhat different from the 'Hindu India' known from the ancient Hindu literature. So the early history of India can hardly be started from the sixth century B C. in the manner it is done these days by many historians, rather text-book-writers, on the basis of Buddhist literature.

'The Rise of Magadha' is another myth built up by these historians. In a Jātaka story it has been said that the king of Koşala gave certain villages of Kāśī to Bimbisāra, and later to his son Ajātaśatru, in dowry. Now, not only this story is accepted as history but also it is presumed that the whole mahājanapada of Kāśī came to be included in the kingdom of Magadha. Similarly on the basis of a Jain as well as Buddhist legend: that Ajātaśatru conquered the town of Vaiśālī, belonging to the small Lichchhavi clan, it is held that he incorporated the whole of north-eastern India into his kingdom. Very vague statements in the Purānas, suggesting humilation of some kings of Avanti at the hands of Śiśunāga and the defeat of certain Kshatriyas by Mahāpadmananda, are not only taken to be historical but also sure evidences of annexation of entire Avanti to Magadha by Śiśunāga and that of all the contemporary kingdoms of the whole of northern India to the same by the first Nanda king whose

successor is known by the Classical historians of Alexander as the king of at most Prasii and Gangaridae, both situate on the 'farthest' (lower) banks of the Ganges.

The Buddhist and Jain lists of ancient kings deal only with those of certain parts of India from the sixth to the third century B. C. when their great leaders lived—Buddha, Mahâvîra, Aśoka and Sampadi. The foreign rulers of India are generally outside their scope. But the Purāṇas contain the lists of almost all kings of northern India from C. 1000 B. C. to C. 400 A. D. While the pre-Mauryan kings of these lists are mostly legendary, the post-Mauryan ones ruled in central and southern India only. The Purāṇas do not contain the lists of the post-Mauryan kings of northern India probably because their compilers had no access to the details of foreign dynasties ruling there. However, they do refer to the foriegn invaders, named Yavanas, Pahlavas, Śakas, Tushâras and Hūṇas, in very strong terms. They also mention some of *their dynasties consisting of several generations of rulers.* They only fail to give the time and place of the kings of these dynasties. But now with the help of numerous coins, inscriptions and accounts in Indian as well as foreign literatures, coming into the lime-light after the time of Vincent Smith, these kings are known to have ruled over northern India after the Mauryas. Thus the old historical traditions of India also support, rather than contradict, the *theory of foreign rule* in ancient India. The 'Dark Period' of Vincent Smith in the history of north India has turned to be the main period of foreign rule in ancient India proper, linked up with the still earlier foreign occupation of north-western India (modern Pakistan).

4. CENTRE OF GRAVITY

By the time Vincent Smith wrote the *first early history* of India, the researchers of ancient Indian history had been

able to gather information mainly about two empires of ancient India—the Mauryan and the Gupta. Accidentally both these empires had their centres in Magadha. So Magadha came to be regarded as the centre of gravity of ancient Indian history. But now we have got some more information about ancient India which shows that while Magadha was the seat of only two empires, the north-western India witnessed a series of empires founded by different foreign invaders coming through the western passes. As determined by geography, in reality the centre of gravity of ancient Indian history, like that of the medieval Indian history, lies in the North-West, not in Magadha.

CHAPTER II

THE ACHAEMENIDS

History proper starts with the emergence of great kings known definitely from their inscriptions, remains of palaces, and chronicles. Apart from the small tribal chiefs, whose names per chance occur in the religious legendary literature, Aśoka is the first such king of India. Before him Alexander the Great is known to have conquered one part of the country, which was earlier still occupied by the Achaemenids There is some evidence for the fact that Alexander as well as the Achaemenids paved the way for Aśoka and his grandfather Chandragupta Maurya, the earliest emperors of Aryan India. Thus the history of India may be traced from the time of the Achaemenids, who first developed so highly the art of empire-building among the Aryans.

1. CYRUS THE GREAT

The Achaemenid empire was built up by Cyrus the Great (C. 558-529 B. C.). Starting his career as a petty chief in the district of Susiana, this wonderful military genius conquered no less than three empires, which had been established before him. The defeat of Astyages the Mede in 550 B. C., of Croesus the Lydian in 547 B. C., and of Babylon in 539 B.C. brought under him almost the whole of western Asia. He annexed even some more territories in the west as well as in the east, and at last he thus created an immense empire *stretching from Greece in the west to the regions far beyond* Persia in the east, such as Bactria (Bakhtrish), Sogdia (Suguda) and Massagetae (Saka) in the north ; and Aria (Haraiva), Arachosia (Hauravatish) and Gedrosia (Makâ) in the south. India of this time lay just beyond these regions. Unfortunately, however, we have no accurate knowledge of

the extent of Cyrus' hold in this country. Some vague statements of the Classical historians are our only source of information on this matter.

It seems that at this time there were two routes from Persia to India. One of them ran through the vast deserts of Gedrosia. It was followed by Alexander for his return from India. The historians of Alexander testify to the great difficulties of this route which cost Alexander not only a large part of his army but even his life. An account of Alexander's admiral Nearchus, as preserved by Arrian and Strabo, indicates that Cyrus tried in vain to invade India through this route. According to this account, Alexander, when planning his march through Gedrosia, was told by the inhabitants "that no one had ever before escaped with an army by this route excepting Semiramis on her flight from India. And she, they said, escaped with only twenty of her army and Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, in his turn with only seven. For Cyrus also came into these parts with the purpose of invading India, but was prevented through losing the greater part of his army owing to the desolate and impracticable character of the route."[1]

The second route ran from Persia to Bactria, Sogdia and Sythia via the Kâbul valley, which was inhabited at this time by Indian tribes, and was included in India by many Classical writers. Through the Kâbul valley this route passed on to the Indus valley, which too was included in India of this time. Alexander followed this route in coming to India.

Megasthenes, as quoted by Strabo,[2] informs that through this route "the Indians had never engaged in foreign warfare, nor had they ever been invaded and conquered by a

foreign power, except by Hercules and Dionysus and lately by the Macedonians." After mentioning several famous conquerors, who did not attack India, he continues, "Semiramis, however, died before carrying out her undertaking; and the Persians, although they got mercenary troops from India, namely the Hydrakes,[1] did not make an expedition into that country, but merely approached it when Cyrus was marching against the Massagetae."[2]

In a statement of Arrian also, where no authority has been quoted, it has been said that according to the Indians, no one before Alexander, with the exception of Dionysus and Hercules, had invaded their country, "not even Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, although he marched against the Scythians and showed himself in other respects the most enterprising of Asiatic monarchs."[3]

At another place[4] Arrian says that "The regions beyond the river Indus on the west are inhabited, up to the river

---

1. Probably Oxydrakai of Alexander's historians who lived in the lower Rāvī-Sutlej doab.

2. Massagetae were a Scythic people living to the east of the river Oxus (Herodotus, I, 201, 204-208, 211, 216 and IV, 11)

3. Arrian, Indica, IX, 10; and V, 4—11.

4. Arrian, Indica, I, 1-3. See also IHQ, XXV, 1949, pp. 154 ff. where Dr. R. C. Majumdar has tried to prove this statement of Arrian to be untrue. But the arguments of the learned Doctor do not appear to us to be quite conclusive. He has put forth mainly three arguments in support of his view:

(1) The conquest of India at the hands of the Assyrians and the Medes has little evidence in its support. So the Persian conquest also may not be true.

(2) Arrian who makes this statement about Cyrus lived after more than six hundred years had elapsed since the time of Cyrus.

(3) The land mentioned by Arrian to be under Cyrus should have been at this time under Pukkusāti, the king of Gandhāra, who conquered Pradyota of Avanti and sent an embassy to Bimbisāra of Magadha.

(For references to this Buddhist legend, see Dict. of Pāli Proper Names by Malalasekera, Vol. II, p. 215, Buddhist India, p. 25, and Essay on Guṇāḍhya, p. 176).

Even if the Assyrian and Median conquests of this region be not true, it would be difficult to presume with certainty the inaccuracy of the Persian sovereignty in this country only on this basis. The fact that Arrian lived much after Cyrus is, no doubt, true; but it is a well known thing

Kophen (Kâbul), by two Indian tribes, the Astakenoi and the Assakenoi, who are not men of great stature like the Indians on the other side of the Indus, nor so brave, nor yet so swarthy as most Indians. They were in old times subject to the Assyrians, then after a period of Median rule submitted to the Persians, and paid to Cyrus, the son of Cambyses, the tribute from their land which Cyrus had imposed......... In the dominions of the Assakenoi there is a great city called Massaga, the seat of the sovereign power which controls the whole realm. And there is another city, Peucelaitis,[1] which is also of great size and not far from the Indus. These settlements lie on the other side of the river Indus, and extend in a westward direction as far as the Kophen." It is possible that some kings of the Kābul valley submitted to Gyrus without any warfare, as some of their successors did to Alexander later on.

In Cyropaedia, a romance on the life of Cyrus Xenophon says that Cyrus "brought under his rule Bactrians and Indians as forming a part of his wide-spread empire." In the same work he also gives the story of an embassy sent to Cyrus by an Indian king with some money. If true, all this also may refer to Cyrus' suzerainty over the Kābul valley. It is not impossible that also some tribes living in the Punjab, one of which might be the Hydrakes, who are said to have contributed some mercenaries to his army, accepted Cyrus' authority in anticipation of his help against their rivals when he had come to the Kābul valley. (Āmbhi of Takshaśilā had submitted to Alexander while the latter had not even reached India.)

2. CAMBYSES

Cyrus was succeeded by his son Cambyses (B. C. 529-522). Xenophon, or his continuator, speaks of almost immediate uprisings by subject nations after the death of Cyrus.[1] These revolutions might have stirred even the newly conquered eastern regions of the empire. But ultimately Cambyses appears to have overcome them all, and to have maintained the integrity of his kingdom. The remaining few years of the short reign of this great king were spent in the remarkable feat of subjugating Egypt and some other parts of northern Africa. There is no record of any fresh activity on the eastern frontier in his time.

3. DARIUS I

In the spring of 522 B. C. Cambyses died childless while returning from his campaigns in Egypt. He had been in Egypt for a full period of three years, not ever having returned to Persia in the interval. In his long absence disaffection developed, and a Magian, Gaumata by name, personating Bardes (Bardiya or Smerdis), the king's brother, became king even before the death of Cambyses. This pretender was, however, killed in the autumn of 5'2 B. C. by Darius who then ascended the throne of Cyrus and Cambyses. After suppression of numerous formidable revolts, he continued to rule till 486 B. C. For the reign of this king (522-486 B. C.) we have documentary evidence of the highest value in his inscriptions. From these inscriptions we can trace with plausible certainty the general outline of the Persian dominion in India in the time of Darius. The following records require special consideration in this connection :[2]

1. The Behistun inscription of the column no. I. Here

1. Xenophon, Cyrop., III, 8, 2.
2. For these inscriptions see Roland G. Kent, Old Persian.

Darius enumerates twenty three provinces of his empire including Gadara and Śatagu.

2. One of the inscriptions on the south retaining wall of the palace of Persepolis. It mentions Gadara, Śatagu and even Hidu among the provinces of Darius.

3. The inscription on two gold and two silver plates discovered at Persepolis in 1936. Here the kingdom of Darius has been described to extend from the land of the Scythians beyond Sogdiana to Ethiopia, and from Hidu to Sardis.

4. An inscription inscribed behind the figure of Darius at his tomb in Naqsh-i-Rustam. It also mentions Śatagu, Gadara and Hidu as the provinces of Darius.

5. An inscription found in several fragments in Old Persian, Elamite and Akkadian languages on some tablets recovered at Susa. It gives a list of the provinces of Darius, as given in Naqsh-i-Rustam inscription, including Śatagu, Gadara and Hidu.

6. An inscription on the building of the palace at Susa with fragments of many copies on clay and marble tablets, and on the glazed tiles of the frieze of the great hall. It describes the materials and workmen brought from different provinces for construction of the palace. According to it the timber was brought from Gadara, and the ivory from Hidu.

7. One inscription on enamelled bricks forming a frieze in one of the halls at Susa. It mentions the provinces of Gadara, Śatagu and Hidu under Darius.

8. An inscription in duplicate on a gold and a silver plate discovered at Hamadan. It is the same as the inscription on the gold and silver plates from Persepolis, and it refers to Hidu as one of the boundaries of the empire of Darius.

9. Śatagu and Hidu appear as satrapies even in the iez inscription.

From all these inscriptions it is quite clear that the empire of Darius included among others the countries of Śatagu, Gadara and Hidu, and that Hidu was situated on the eastern-most border of the empire.

Śatagu and Gadara figure in the Behistun inscription, which is the earliest record of Darius engraved probably only two or three years after his coronation. During these years Darius was terribly busy in suppressing numerous rebellions all over the empire, and can hardly be expected to occupy himself with any new conquest. There is no evidence for annexation of any territory in the eastern side even during the short turbulent reign of Cambyses. So these two provinces might have been included in the Persian empire from the time of Cyrus.[1] As mentioned above Xenophon, Megasthenes and Arrian suggest inclusion of at least the Kābul valley, which was known as Gadara, in the empire of Cyrus.

Hidu is conspicuous by its absence in the Behistun inscription, although it appears in all other records of later times as a province of the empire. It is likely that Darius himself conquered it some time after his succession to the throne. A passage from the 'History' of Herodotus, quoted below, actually attributes the survey and conquest of the lower Indus valley, where this province was situate, to Darius. Some historians think that Darius conquered Hidu between 518 and 515 B. C.[2]

Among the sculptures found at Naqsh-i-Rustam and Persepolis there are representations of the provinces of the empire of Darius. According to Professor Herzfeld, "All the three (representations of Śatagu, Gadara and Hidu) are

1. See G B Gray and M. Cary, CAH, IV, p 183; E. Herzfeld, MASI, 34, p. 3 and others. Herzfeld (Ind. Antiqua, 1947, pp. 181-184) says that these provinces were included in the Median empire conquered by Cyrus.

2. Jackson, CHI, I, P. 300, and Herzfeld, MASI, 34, p. 2. See also Olmstead, Hist. Pers. Emp., p 145

identical ; they are naked but for a loin cloth and a sort of turban on their heads ; and their weapon is a long, broad sword hanging by a strap from the shoulder. As a matter of fact the climate of the plateau of eastern Iran does not permit, and never permitted, so primitive a clothing; these three nations were inhabitants of the low lands of India."[1]

There is some more evidence for the location of these provinces in the Indus basin. The Classical Graeco-Roman literature leaves no doubt on the point that Gedrosia, Arachosia, Drangiana and Aria occupied all the land situated just to the west of the Indus basin. These countries are represented respectively by the Achaemenian provinces of Makâ, Hauravatish, Zranka and Haraiva. So the province of Hidu, being situated in the easternmost part of the empire, must be placed in the Indus basin. Gadara and Śatagu also, mentioned together with Hidu in the inscriptions and having no room for themselves to the west of the Indus, are very likely to have been situated in the same area.

So far as the exact locaticn of each one of these three provinces is concerned, the Old Persian Gadara is Gandhāra in Sanskrit. From the Epics and some other works of Sanskrit literaure we know that Gandhāra was situated near-about the lower Kābul valley. In the time of Darius most probably this country extended a little more to the west and included even the Hindukush region. In the trilingual Achaemenid inscriptions the same province which is named as Gadara in the Old Persian version is called Paruparaesanna in the Babylonian and Elamite versions.[2] It means that Gadara was identical with Paruparaesanna, which in the Old Persian means the country "On the other side of the Mountain"

Hindukush ; and the latter is identical with the Paropamisadae (the Hindukush region) of the Classical Graeco-Roman writers, some of whom say clearly that Paropamisadae included Gandaridae.[1]

Śatagu is most probably Sattagydae of the Graeco-Roman literature. There is no definite information about its location. But *most probably it was contiguous with* Gandhāra because Herodotus has *placed it in the same satrapy in which* Gandhāra was included. Taking it to be a Medo-Pāli corruption of Sanskrit Sapta-Sindhu and Old Persian Hapta-Hidu, Herzfeld has suggested its location near-about modern Punjab,[2] well-known as "The Land of Seven Rivers" in ancient India as well as Iran.

Hidu is, no doubt, Sindhu in Sanskrit. From the earliest historical period up till now it is the name of the lower Indus valley.

Besides inscriptions, the 'History' of Herodotus is another source of information for India of the time of Darius. *Unfortunately,* however, in the *name of India this work* mostly deals with the things like 'gold-digging ants' known from travellers' tales. Also its account of the satrapies of Darius is somewhat different from that of the inscriptions. It gives the number of the satrapies to be twenty in the place of twenty three, or even more, of the inscriptions. It does name all the three Indian countries known from the inscriptions, but says that they were organised within two satrapies only: "...... he (Darius I) divided his *dominions into twenty governments,* called by the Persians satrapies; and doing so and appointing governors, he ordained that each several nation should pay him tribute ; to this end he united each nation with *its closest neighbour, and beyond these nearest* lands, assigned those that were further off some to one and some to another nation.........The Sattagydae, Gandarii, Dadicae

1. Eratosthenes in Strabo, XV, 2, 9 ; and Diodorus, XVIII, 5-6.

2. MASI, 34, p. 9 ; and Ind. Antiqua, pp. 151-154.

and Aparytae paid together an hundred and seventy talents; this was the seventh province......The Indians made up the twentieth province. These are more in number than any nation known to me; and they paid a greater tribute than any other province, namely three hundred and sixty talents of gold dust."[1] It is thought that the population of India alone was equal to the population of all the other provinces taken together, and the tribute paid by her, one-third of that of them all.

The most valuable information given by Herodotus relates to the survey and conquest of the Indus valley. "A great part of Asia was explored under the direction of Darius. He being desirous to know in what part the Indus, which is the second river that produces crocodiles, discharges itself into the sea, sent in ships both others on whom he could rely to make a true report and also Skylax of Caryanda. They accordingly setting out from the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Pactyice, sailed down the river toward the east and sunrise to the sea; then sailing on the sea westward, they arrived in the thirtieth month at that place where the king of Egypt dispatched the Phoenicians, whom I before mentioned, to sail round Libya. After these persons had sailed round, Darius subdued the Indians and frequented this sea."[2]

The suggestion of the inscriptions that Darius himself conquered the Indians living in the lower Indus valley, where the river discharged itself into the sea, is confirmed by this passage. Unfortunately, however, the details of the conquests provided by the passage can be hardly ascertained.

There is little accurate information about the city or the country from which the survey is said to have started. At one place Herodotus says that they lay near the Indians, who were settled northward of the other Indians, and whose

1. Herod., III, 89-94.

2. Ibid., IV, 44.

mode of life resembled that of the Bactrians.[1] Hecataeus, the famous Greek geographer of the time of Darius, sometimes uses the name Pactyice in the place of Gandhāra and speaks of a city called Kaspapyrus (Kaspatyrus?) as a city of Gandarians.[2] Herzfeld thinks that Pactyice is Paxtu (Paśto) in Old Iranian.[3] On these and some other grounds most of our historians believe that this survey started from the uppermost parts of the Indus or from some point on the river Kābul.[4] It has been clearly stated in the passage that the survey covered not only the Indus upto the sea, but also the whole of the sea-coast from India to Egypt. After the survey Darius is said to have conquered the Indians, and to have used the sea. But neither the precise location of the Indians nor the definite nature of the use of the sea has been mentioned. Most probably, like Alexander, he floated all over the Indus with an army which subdued the unsubmissive tribes and used the sea, flanking the whole southern side of his vast empire from Egypt to India, as an easier line of communication than the long, arduous land-route. The Suez inscription shows that Darius, who cut the fore-runner of the Suez canal, was interested in finding out such lines of communication. In the words of a famous historian of Iran, "This enterprise was a political as much as an administrative measure, and was also probably inspired by the commercial aims that always acted as a stimulus to the plans of Darius."[5] At any rate, this act of Darius placed so populous and so rich India for the first time in the whirl-pool of the world politics of that time. It not only brought the isolated

1. Herod., III, 102.

2. Cf. Fragments 174-179 in Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, ed. C. Muller.

3. India Antiqua, 1947, p. 182.

4. R. C. Majumdar (IHQ, XXV, 1949, p. 100) had once thrown doubt on this point without much justification. However, now he appears to have changed his opinion and to have accepted the identification of Pactyice with the ethnic name Pakhtun or the Indian Pathan (The Class. Accts. of India, 1960, p. 4, fn. 2).

5. R. Ghirshman, Iran, p. 146.

tribes of the whole Indus valley together but also welded India with the western world. The following chapters show that later India met Greece and Rome mid-way in Iran; and the Classical civilizations of all the three grew together in close contact with one another.

The reign of Darius marks the highest point of the Achaemenid expansion towards India. At present there is no evidence to show that anyone of his successors tried to extend the boundaries of his empire furthermore in this direction. In fact after Darius the whole discussion about the Achaemenid empire in India hinges round as to the time upto which the Achaemenids remained in possession of the conquests of Darius in the east. Dr. Majumdar is of the opinion that there are "no legitimate grounds to conclude that the Persian domination over that part of India, which was conquered by Darius, continued after his death."[1] However, it appears to be an extreme view. There are some evidences to show that the eastern boundary of the empire of Darius remained intact for a long time after his death.

4. XERXES

In 486 B.C. Darius was succeeded by his son Xerxes who continued to rule upto 465 B.C. In one of his Persepolis inscriptions[2] this king gives the list of his provinces which includes all the three Indian provinces: Gandhāra, Śatagu and Sindhu. Thus Xerxes seems to have retained all the dominions of Darius in India. In this connection may be cited two plates of Xerxes' tribute-payers also: one showing the Thattagush (Śatagu) with weapons and a marvellous humped bull; and the other depicting the Sindhu with gold double-axes and a beautiful wild ass.[3]

1. R. C. Majumdar, loc. cit., p. 165.

2. Kent, op. cit., p. 151.

3. Herzfeld, Iran in the Ancient East, p. 272, pls. LXXIX and LXXX.

The Classical authors inform us that in the contingents which Xerxes led against the Greeks in the field of Marathon and Thermopylae the Indians fought side by side with the Iranians. Herodotus describes the Indian infantry as follows: "The Indians, clad in garments made of cotton, carried bows of cane and arrows of cane, the latter tipped with iron; and thus accustomed the Indians were marshalled under the command of Pharnazathres (to judge from his name, probably a Persian), son of Artabates."[1] Regarding the Indian cavalry he says that they were "armed with the same equipment as in the case of the infantry, but they brought riding horses and chariots, the latter being drawn by horses and wild asses."[2] An immense number of Indian dogs also have been said to have followed the army of Xerxes in his Grecian invasion.[3] This presence of not only some mercenaries but a whole Indian army in the imperial camp has perhaps rightly been taken by some historians as a proof for the continuance of the Persian domination in large parts of the Indus valley during the reign of Xerxes.[4]

5. ARTAXERXES I AND II

The period following the defeat of the Persian arms under Xerxes by Greece marks the beginning of the decadence of the Achaemenid empire. We have, however, certain records on the South Tomb at Persepolis, usually assinged on artistic grounds either to Artaxerxes I (B. C. 465-425) or to Artaxerxes II (B. C. 405-359) which show that in the east this empire continued as a whole for a much longer time. Here about the throne of the great king there are the figures of tribute-payers exactly as at the tomb of Darius the Great, but in a far better state of preservation.

---

1. Herod., VII, 65.
2. Ibid., VII, 86.
3. Ibid., VII, 187.
4. Jackson, CHI, Vol. I, p. 342; and H. C. Raychaudhuri, Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, p. 31

Three of these figures bear above them the following epigraphs :—

Iyam Sataguviya.
(This is the Sattagydian)

Iyam Ga (n) dariya.
(This is the Gandarian)

Iyam Hi (n) duviya.
(This is the man of Sind).[1]

Thus Artaxerxes I or II seems to have maintained intact the Persian empire created by the genius of Darius and his predecessors. Some historians have, however, expressed the opinion that here "the list of peoples is copied verbatim from the inscriptions of Darius," and "no sure inference can, therefore, be drawn from this record regarding Persian dominion in India after the time of Darius."[2] But in the absence of any tangible evidence to the contrary, it is not proper to set aside this contemporary epigraphic evidence.

Ctesias, who served Artaxerxes I and probably even his immediate successor, Darius II, as physician, says that he himself saw some presents which were sent by the Indian kings to the Persian emperor.[3]

Some scholars believe that the province-wise tribute list of Herodotus given above is for his own time, that is, the reign of Artaxerxes I, and not, as Herodotus himself states, for that of Darius.[4] If it were so, it would have not only confirmed the maintenance of the whole of the empire of Darius by Artaxerxes I, but, as Herodotus has enumerated some provinces not found even in the list of the inscriptions of Darius, it might imply even some fresh conquests by Artaxerxes I. In view of the clear statement of Herodotus

1. Kent, op. cit., p. 156
2. R. C. Majumdar, op. cit., p 166.
3. Ctesias, Indica, I, 29, and Aelian, De Nat. Aminae., IV, 21.
4. Debevoise, A Political History of Parthia, p. 6. See also Chattopadhyaya, IHQ, Vol., XXV, 1949, pp. 196-197.

himself, it is, however, not justified to refer this list arbitrarily not to Darius, as he states, but to Artaxerxes I.

6. DARIUS III

In the Classical literature the next reference to the Indians in connection with the Persians occurs in allusion to the war of Darius .III (336-330 B. C.) against Alexander the Great at the field of Arbela (331 B. C.). According to Arrian three distinct groups of Indians figured in the army which mustered under the banner of the Persian monarch at that place : "The Indians who were conterminous with the Bactrians, as also the Bactrians themselves, and the Sogdians had come to the aid of Darius, all being under the command of Bessus, the viceroy of the land of Bactria. They were followed by the Sacians, a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwell in Asia. These were not subject to Bessus but were in alliance with Darius.........Barsentes, the viceroy of Arachosia, led the Arachosians and the men who were called Mountaineer Indians. There were a few elephants, about fifteen in number, belonging to the Indians, who live on this side of the Indus. With these forces Darius had encamped at Gaugamela, near the river Bumodus, about 600 stades distant from the city of Arbela."[1] This passage shows that the Indians in the army of Darius III came from the lands lying to the west of the Indus as well as those lying to the east of it. On its basis Dr. Jackson has held that the Persian domination of the whole Indus valley continued upto this time.[2] Dr. Majumdar has pointed out that in contrast to the satraps of Bactria and Arachosia, here there is no reference to the Persian satrap of India; and the Indians of the Persian army might be only mercenaries.[3] But as a matter of fact the passage mentions the Sacians, who were probably mercenaries, as such. It also mentions

1. Arrian, Anabasis, III, 8, 3-6.
2. CHI, I, p. 341.
3. IHQ, XXV, 1949, p. 151.

only those satraps who were commanders indicating that only one commander might be in charge of the troops of several satrapies. Bessus, the satrap of Bactria, was in command of the troops of not only Bactria but also of the Sogdians (of the province of Suguda) and of the Indians, who lived near the Bactrians (of the province of Paruparaesanna or Gandhāra); and Barsentes, the satrap of Arachosia, was in charge of the contingents from not only Arachosia but also from the Mountaineer Indians (probably of the province of Śatagu which stretched upto the foothills of the western Himalayas). The Indians, who came from the eastern side of the Indus with some elephants, might belong to the province of Sindhu.

In a tradition,[1] preserved in some late works such as Pseudotkallishthenes and its Syriac version and the Shah-Namah, it is stated that Darius wrote a letter to Poros for help against Alexander. Political relationship between the Achaemenid emperor and Poros is not impossible, but the tradition may hardly be taken to be historical in absence of some more reliable evidence.

By defeating Darius III at Arbela, Alexander brought the Achaemenid empire to an end. Through his advance in India, the historians have tried to find out the position of the Achaemenid empire in India at the time of its end. Dr. Jackson says that "when Alexander reached the river Hyphasis, the ancient Vipāśā and modern Beās, and was then forced by his own generals and soldiers to start upon his retreat, he had touched the extreme eastern limits of the Persian domains, over which he had triumphed throughout.[2] Some other historians, on the other hand, think that as Alexander came across no Persian satrap or any other

1. Buddha Prakash, List of Papers and Summaries, Ind. Hist. Cong., 1951, pp. 15-16.

2. Op. cit., p. 341. See also Dr. Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya, IHQ, XXVI, 1950, p. 100.

sign of the Persian domination in the Indus basin, and as his historians assert that he was the first conqueror of India, the Indus valley, if ever under the Persians, must have been lost to them much before the invasion of Alexander.[1] In this connection it may be pointed out that the Achaemenid imperilism in the Indus valley appears actually to have been *some sort of political supremacy accepted by the local kings*, rather than effective control by the imperial officials. In this case there is no question of Persian satraps and signs of Persian imperialism in this region. One passage from Strabo indicates that at the time of the invasion of Alexander the lands lying to the west of the Indus formed a part of the Persian empire : "The views, set forth by Eratosthenes in the third book of his geography in a summary concerning the country regarded as India at the time of its invasion by Alexander, are the most creditable of all. At that period the Indus formed the boundary between India and Ariane which lay immediately to the west, and was subject to the Persians".[2] According to Curtius up to the time of Alexander's invasion some Indian tribes like the Oxydrakais and Mallois, living much to the east of the Indus, paid tribute to the Arachosians, that is, the Persian satrap of Arachosia.[3] The historians of Alexander might have proclaimed Alexander as the first conqueror of India out of exaggeration or ignorance.

The discussion of the Achaemenian civilization and its influence on India requires a new chapter which is outside the scope of the task in hand. But it may be noted that for maintaining their empire, the Achaemenids built good roads studded with posts ; raised strong forts and grand palaces ; developed a centralized machinery of efficient administra-

1. W.W. Tarn, Anc. Camb. Hist., Vol.VI, p. 403; and R C. Majumdar, loc. cit., pp. 163-5.
2. Strabo, Geog., XV, 10.
3. Curt., IX, 7.

duced the Kābul valley and the Punjab as far as the Beās and the whole of the spacious valley of the Indus downwards to the ocean itself.[1] He could have penetrated even to the Ganges, had his army consented to follow him; and, in the opinion of Sandrokottos,[2] would have succeeded in adding to his empire the vast regions through which that river flowed.

The rapidity with which Alexander achieved his actual conquests in the country appears all the more surprising when we take into account the fact that at every stage of his advance he encountered a most determined resistance.[3] "The people were not only of a most martial temperament, but were at the same time inured to arms." Diodoros informs us that at Massaga, where Alexander treacherously massacred the mercenaries, "the women, taking the arms of the fallen, fought side by side with the men."[4] Poros, when he saw most of his forces scattered, his elephants lying dead or straying riderless, did not flee as Darius Codomannus had twice fled, but remained fighting, seated on an elephant of commanding height, and received nine wounds before he was taken prisoner. The Malloi almost succeeded in killing the Macedonian king. In the valley of the Indus Alexander could overpower the opposition instigated by the Brāhmaṇas only by means of wholesale massacres and executions. But all this was of no avail.

M'Crindle has attributed the defeat of the Indians,

---

1. For the details of this invasion, see M'Crindle, Ancient India, Its Invasion by Alexander the Great.

2. Plutarch, Life of Alex., Ch. LXII. Cf. M'Crindle, l. c., p. 311. Tarn thinks that Alexander would have hardly dreamt of conquering Magadha which was quite unknown to him; and that in this passage Plutarch gives his name in confusion for the name of Demetrios (Alex., II, 1950, pp. 282-3). But from other historians of Alexander also we hear that he did learn about Magadha from Phegeus and Poros, and was willing to conquer it. In this passage Plutarch does not say that Alexander conquered Magadha. There is no question of confusing Alexander for Demetrios.

3. For a study of the invasion of Alexander from the point of view of Indian resistance, see R. S. Tripathi, Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong., 1939, Calcutta, pp 348 ff: IHQ, XVI, 1940, pp. 683 ff: and a Hist Anc. Ind., pp. 117 ff.

4. Diod., XVII, 84. Cf. M'Crindle, l. c., p. 270.

inspite of their warlike qualities, to the division of north-western India at this time in several states.[1] Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri has enumerated no less than twenty-eight independent authorities at this time in the Punjab and Sind,[2] which had their own armies and right of making war or alliance. These states were, moreover, separated from each other through marked differences in their political and social systems. While some of them were kingdoms, others were oligarchies, and still others republics. E. R. Bevan thinks that at this time this region was passing through a conflict between monarchy and republicanism, the rājās were fighting to extend their authority over the free tribes, and the free tribes were fighting to repel the rājās.[3] The kings themselves were fighting with one another for supremacy. Curtius tells us[4] that Āmbhi, the ruler of Takshaśilā, was at war with Abhisares and Poros. Arrian informs us that Poros and Abhisares were not only enemies of Takshaśilā but also of the neighbouring autonomous tribes. On one occasion the two kings marched against the Kathaians.[5] The Mallois and the Oxydrakais were on enmity before the invasion of their territories by Alexander,[6] and, according to Diodoros, they could not agree upon selection of a common commander even at the time of invasion.[7] Sambos and Mousikanos were also on hostile terms.[8] Owing to these feuds and strifes amongst the petty states, a foreign invader had no united resistance to fear; and he could be assured that many among the local chieftains would receive him with

1. M'Crindle, Invas. of Alex., Intro., p. 4.

2. PHAI, pp. 245-259.

3. CHI, Vol. I, p. 345.

4. VIII, 12. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 202. See also Arrian, V, 18. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 108.

5. Arr., V, 22. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 115.

6. Curt., IX, 4. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 234; and Diod., XVII, 93. Cf M'Crindle, p. 287.

7. Diod, XVII, 98. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 287.

8. Arr., VI, 16. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 159.

open arms out of hatred for their neighbours. Alexander actually obtained assistance from many important chiefs like Āmbhi of Takshaśilā, Sangaeus of Pushkalāvatī, Kophaios, Arsagetes, Sisikottos and at one stage Younger Poros and Sambos. The only princes or peoples who thought of combining against the invader were Poros and Abhisares, and the Mallois and the Oxydrakais. Even in these cases personal jealousies prevented any effective results. Alexander met with stubborn resistance only from individual chiefs and clans, notably from the Astes, the Aspasians, the Assakenians, elder Poros, the Kathians, the Mallois and the Oxydrakais. But these united people could not long resist the invader. Organization of state and army, military science, and diplomacy, with all other aspects of society, appear to be very backward in India at this time compared to Greece and Macedonia. Gripped in the clutches of caste system, heterogeneous Indian society had already become too static to resist any strong invasion.

2. FORMATION OF PROVINCES

Alexander was willing to retain the conquered territories into his world-wide empire. With this thing in view, he went on forming the conquered lands into his provinces and appointing governors over them. There are indications that he established the following provinces in India.[1]

1. Tyriaspes was appointed the satrap of the land of the Paropamisadae and the rest of the country as far as the river Kābul.[2] Afterwards he was found guilty of irregularities in the exercise of his authority; and Alexander replaced him by Oxyartes, the father of his wife Roxane.[3]

---

1. In his gazetteer of the satrapies of Alexander, Diodorus (XVIII, 2-6) appears to have put vaguely all his Indian dominions only in a few satrapies. But Tarn has proved this passage to be false (Alexander the Great, II, pp. 276ff.).

2. Arr., Anab., IV, 22. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 58-59.

3. Arr., IV, 15. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 156-157; and Curtius, VIII. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 253.

(2.) Nikanor, one of the companions of Alexander, was made the satrap of the country on the western side of the Indus.[1] Probably he was slain later on. We are told that when Alexander had reached near the Rāvī, the envoys came from Sisikottos, the satrap of the Assakenians, reporting that 'these people' had slain their governor and had revolted from Alexander. Alexander sent Philippos and Tyriaspes to quell the insurrection and restore tranquility and order in the province.[2] Probably Phillippos was made the new satrap of this province because we later hear that on his voyage down the Jhelum to the sea, Alexander ordered Philippos, the 'satrap of the province lying west of the Indus in the direction of the Bactrians', to follow him with his troops after an interval of three days.[3] Philippos accompanied Alexander's expedition down the Jhelum, and the territories extending as far south as the confluence of the rivers of the Punjab were added to his province.[4] While Alexander was marching back home, Philippos was murdered treacherously by his mercenaries ; and Alexander gave charge of his province to Eudemos and Āmbhi pending appointment of a new satrap.[5]

3. Arrian calls Sisikottos as the satrap of the Assakenians.[6]

4. Philip, the son of Makhatas, was made satrap of the land between the Indus and the Jhelum.[7]

5. Some small principalities of this region were merged into the subordinate state of Āmbhi, the king of Takshaśilā.[8]

6. King Poros, who fought Alexander so bravely making a favourable impression upon him, was appointed the

1. Arr., IV, 28. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 72.
2. Arr, V, 20. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 112.
3. Arr, VI, 2. Cf. M'Crindle. pp. 133-134.
4. Arr., VI, 15. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 156.
5. Arr., VI, 27. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 177.
6. Arr., IV, 20. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 112.
7. Arr., V, 8. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 92.
8. Ibid.

satrap of a very large territory extending from the Jhelum to the Beās.[1] According to Arrian this territory contained seven nations and more than 2000 cities. Strabo gives the number of the nations to be nine, and that of the cities 500, not one of which was less than Kos Meropis. According to Curtius[2] Alexander established friendship between Poros and Āmbhi of Takshaśilā ruling to the west of the Jhelum. A marriage alliance was also executed between them. It must have created peace and order in Alexander's empire.

(7) King Abhisares was made the satrap of the northernmost parts of Alexander's empire in India comprising his own kingdom and the kingdom of Arsakes[3]. A certain amount was fixed for him to pay as tribute.

8. The satrapy of Peithon, the son of Agenor, covered Sind from the Indus confluence to the ocean extending westward to the Hab.[4]

9. Curtius[5] informs us that Alexander accepted submission of the Mallois and the Sudrakais and imposed on them the tribute which the two nations paid in instalments to the Arachosians. He further ordered them to furnish him with 2500 horsemen. It is possible that the small republics were allowed to exist after their acceptance of allegiance to Alexander.

10. Alexander had left a satrap, Apollophanes, to rule the territory of the Oritae.[6] But this satrap was later on dismissed and replaced by Thoas who fell ill and died. Siburtio, the satrap of Karmania, was now made satrap of this district and even of Arachosia and Gedrosia.[7]

1. Arr., V, 20, 29 and VI, 2. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 114-115, 129, 133. Strabo, XV, 8. See also Curtius, Chap. IV.

2. Curtius, IV, 3. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 232.

3. Arr., V, 29. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 129-130.

4. Arr., VI, 15. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 157.

5. Curt., IX, 7. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 248.

6. Arr., VI, 22. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 169.

7. Arr., VI, 27. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 177.

11. Tlepolemos, the son of Pythophanes, was appointed the satrap of Karmania.[1]

12. According to Arrian,[2] Alexander left a noble, named Oxyartes, as a satrap somewhere on the lower Indus with Peithon. We have seen already that Oxyartes, the father-in-law of Alexander, was satrap of Paropamisadae. Neise thinks that these two satraps were the same; but Bevan rightly points out that this view is hard to suppose since the two satraps were not contiguous.[3] It is not impossible that these names indicate two separate satraps.

3. ESTABLISHMENT OF GARRISONS

Now in pursuance of his usual policy Alexander sought to secure his rule in these provinces by garrisoning strategical points with large bodies of troops to overawe and hold in subjection the tribes in their neighbourhood. The number ot these garrisons must have been sufficiently large in his extensive dominions; but the most of the literature providing information about them has been lost. The extant fragments speak of only the following places :—

1. Alexander left Amyntas in the land of Bactrians with 3,500 horse and 10,000 foot.[4]

2. A garrison of Macedonian soldiers, under the command of Philippos, was placed in the city of Peukelaotis (Pushkalāvatī) which lay not far from the Indus.[5]

3. A fort was built upon the rock of Aornos ; and a garrison was placed in it. Sisikottos was given the command of this fort and its garrison.[6]

---

1. Ibid.

2 Anab, VI, 15, 4. M'Crindle, p. 147. Some Scholars think this statement to be a corruption (see Smith, EHI, 4, p. 104, fn, 7).

3. Bevan, The House of Seleucus, I, p. 292.

4. Arr., IV, 22. M'Crindle, p. 69.

5. Arr., IV, 28. M'Crindle, p. 72

6. Arr., IV, 30. M'Crindle, p. 76

4. A garrison was left in Takshaśilā with some invalid soldiers.[1]

5. Hephaistion fortified a city on the Chenāb by the order of Alexander.[2]

6. Over all the country between the rivers Chenāb and Rāvī, which Alexander overran, he planted garrisons in the most suitable places.[3] Unfortunately the Classical authorities have not given us the names of these places.

7. Similarly Alexander entrusted Poros, at the head of his own forces, with introducing the garrisons to the cities which had submitted to him between the Rāvī and the Chenāb.[4]

8. Alexander left with Philippos, the satrap of the lands upto the confluence of the Indus with the other rivers of the Punjab, all the Thracians and as many foot-soldiers[5] as seemed sufficient for the defence of his province.

9. Curtius tells us[6] that a Thracian contingent was left with Eudemos at the upper Indus.

10. Alexander fortified some citadels which protected the cities of the Mousikanos; and placed in them such garrisons as he thought suitable for keeping the surrounding tribes in subjection.[7]

11. Alexander left a garrison in the citadel situated just on the confluence of the Indus and the other rivers of the Punjab.[8]

12. Alexander ordered Peithon to fortify the harbour

1. Arr., V, 8. M'Crindle, p. 92.
2. Arr., V, 29. M'Crindle, p. 129.
3. Arr., V, 20. M'Crindle, p. 114.
4. Arr., V, 22. M'Crindle, p. 116.
5. Arr., VI, 15. M'Crindle, p. 156.
6. Curt., X, 11.
7. Arr., VI, 15, 17. M'Crindle, pp. 158, 160-161; Curtius, IX, 7. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 253.
8. Curtius, IX, 4. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 253.

of Pāṭala where he wanted to leave behind a very considerable naval squadron.[1]

13. On one lake, near the sea-shore, a fortified harbour and dock-yard was built; and a garrison was left there.[2]

14. Alexander left Leonnatos, an officer of the body-guard, in Ora, the capital of the Oreitais, in command of all the Agrianians, some of the archers and cavalry, and the rest of the Grecian mercenary, infantry and cavalry; and instructed him to remain in the country till the fleet sailed past its shores.[3]

4. FOUNDING OF CITIES

This army of occupation was, no doubt, in large part distributed through a number of new cities, which Alexander built and which were intended in Alexander's design not only to give the Greek root in the country but even to quicken India through Greek intelligence and enterprise to new developments of commercial activity and material splendour. We know of several cities built by Alexander :—

1. The city of Alexandria-under-the Kaukasos was built in the land of Paropamisadae, i.e., the Kābul region. Alexander recruited the population of this city with settlers from the surrounding districts, and also with such of his soldiers as were unfit for further service. He appointed one governor to take charge of the city and to regulate its affairs. The former governor of the city had not discharged his duties well. So while coming to invade India, Alexander appointed Nikanor, one of his companions, as the governor of this city.[4]

2. Arigaion, a city in the province of Bajore, occupied very advantageous position. It was fortified by Krateros

1. Arr., VI, 20. M'Crindle, p. 165.
2. Arr., VI, 20. M'Crindle, p 166.
3. Arr., VI, 22. M'Crindle, p. 167.
4. Arr., IV, 22. M'Crindle, p. 58.

under the order of Alexander. It was peopled with as many natives of the neighbourhood as consented to make it their home, together with any soldiers found unfit for further service.[1]

3-4. Alexander founded two cities on the river Jhelum whose sites have not yet been fixed with certainty. One of these stood on the field where Alexander defeated Poros, and the other where his horse died. The former he called Nikaia in honour of his victory over the Indians, and the other Boukephala in memory of his horse Boukephalas which died there.[2] By the order of Alexander, Krateros fortified the cities.[3]

5. According to Plutarch[4], Alexander built a city even in the memory of a pet dog called Peritas when he lost it.

6. Alexander got Hephaistion to fortify a city on the river Chenāb and people it by the neighbouring population and mercenaries unfit for service.[5]

7. Alexander ordered a city to be founded at the very confluence of the rivers of the Punjab. He ordered also the construction of a dock-yard at this place.[6]

8. In the land of Sogdois Alexander fortified a city, founded another city whose name is given to be Alexandria by Diodoros[7] and Curtius,[8] and constructed a dock-yard.[9]

9. By the order of Alexander Peithon put colonists in

1. Arr., IV, 24. M'Crindle, p. 64.
2. Arr., V, 19. M'Crindle, p. 110.
3. Arr., V, 20. M'Crindle, p. 111.
4. Plutarch, Life of Alex., Ch. LXI. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 300.
5. Arr., V, 29. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 129.
6. Arr., VI, 15. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 156.
7. Diod., IX, 8; XVII, 104; Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 253, 297. Diodoros refers to one more city in these parts whose name also was Alexandria (XVII, 102. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 293).
8. Curtius, IX, 8. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 253.
9. Arr., VI, 15. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 157.

some cities of the realm of Mausikanos which had been fortified by the Greeks.[1]

10. Alexander directed Hephaistion to construct a citadel in Pāṭala. He also sent out men into the adjacent country, which was waterless, to dig wells and to make it habitable. Here Alexander also set about the construction of a roadstead and dock.[2] Curtius refers to building of good many cities by Alexander in this region.[3]

11. Alexander also got wells dug on the sea-shore and colonised a place there.[4]

12. Alexander ordered Leonnatos to settle a colony in Ora, the capital of the Oreitais.[5]

5. END OF THE EMPIRE

The establishment of all these satrapies, garrisons, forts, colonised cities and harbours shows that Alexander meant to rule India for long. He did everything upto the end of his life in accordance with this intention. But at last events took such a turn as brought the Macedonian empire in India to a rapid close.

Not even two years had passed since his departure from India, when Alexander died suddenly at Babylon before the completion of his thirty-third year in the summer of 323 B. C. Now a new Alexander was required to wield the newly built vast empire of Alexander. However, not only this new Alexander was wanting, but there was not even a proper ordinary succession This circumstance created a struggle for succession to different parts of Alexander's empire amongst his generals lasting for about two decades.

Alexander had made no arrangements for carrying on the government after his death. He also left no heir to his

1. Arr., VI, 17. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 161-162.
2. Arr., VI, 18. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 161-162.
3. Curtius, IX, 10. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 261.
4. Arr., VI, 20 21. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 166-169.
5. Arr., VI, 22. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 169.

empire. His wife Roxane, an Asiatic princess, was, however, shortly expecting a child. Perdikkas, who was senior hipparch and probably acting chiliarch (vizier), called a council of the generals. He proposed that they should await Roxane's confinement, and, if the child were a boy, make him king. His proposal was accepted by all. But on the instigation of Meleager, a senior phalanx-leader, the infantry refused to acquiesce in it. They were not ready for kingship of the child of a barbarian woman. They chose Arrhidaeus, an illegitimate son of Philip II, who was a half-witted epileptic, as a king with the name of Philip III. Meleager was made his guardian.

It came to a struggle between cavalry and infantry. Meleager tried to murder Perdikkas. Perdikkas, with the cavalry and elephants, left Babylon and blockaded the approaches. The infantry, however, shrank from open war and Eumenes effected a compromise. Philip III and Roxane's child, if a boy, were to be joint kings. Perdikkas was to be formally appointed vizier ; and he was to command the army in Asia with Meleager as second-in-command.

Perdikkas at the first opportunity put Meleager to death. He then, alleging Philip's order, called a council of generals in Babylon (323 B. C.) at which he alloted the satrapies. This allotment was made obviously to reconcile the claims of the fighting generals. It was by no means indicative of freedom from the muddle of succession and emergence of a strong new order. According to it the eastern satraps were retained unchanged, as were Taxiles and Poros in India. This arrangement with regard to the eastern satrapies was made, it seems, not because it was the most salutary in the interests of the Macedonian empire but because of the indifference to these satrapies of the extreme east on the part of the generals, who were real power behind the vacant throne. The eyes of these generals were fixed on the western satrapies, which lay nearer to their homeland ; and they did not want

to waste their power elsewhere even if it was necessary to maintain the integrity of the empire. Not even so much care was taken as to send a satrap which Alexander had promised for the vacant office of Philippos; and virtually the eastern satrapies were left to themselves to develop by and by free status of their own.

Perdikkas remained as executive of the kingship of Macedonia only for a short time of about one year. War between the generals and satraps of Alexander was constantly going on and he was killed in it. After him Antipater became the regent of the Macedonian throne. His first act was to issue a decree from Triparadeisus (321 B. C.) for re-distribution of the satrapies in favour of the generals and satraps of his party. Regarding the Indian satrapies Diodoros informs us: "Antipater then divided the satrapies anew............and gave India, which bordered on the Paropamisadae to Peithon, the son of Agenor; and of adjacent kingdoms he gave that which lay along the Indus to Poros, and that along the Hydaspes to Taxiles for it was impossible to remove their kings without royal troops under the command of some distinguished general."[1]

This passage makes it quite clear that by 321 B. C., that is within two years of Alexander's death, the Indian dominions of the Macedonian empire lying to the east of the Indus had practically become quite independent, and Macedonian authority upon them was only nominal. Allowing for the transposition[2] of the satrapies of Taxiles and

1. Diod., XVIII, 39. Cf. Smith, EHI, p. 115, fn. 2.

2. F. W. Thomas appears to think that Diodoros has placed the satrapy of Poros on the Indus because even Sind was now added to his satrapy (CHI, I., p. 428). Sir John Marshall (Taxila, 1951, Vol. II, p. 18) also supports this view when he says that "they confirmed Taxiles in his kingdom between the Indus and the Jhelum and added the Indus valley to the dominions of Poros, thereby making of that powerful and friendly state an effective buffer stretching from the Hindukush to the sea". See also H. C. Raychoudhuri, Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, pp. 149-150. V. A. Smith (EHI, p. 115, fn. 2 and As'oka, p. 12, fn.), however, thinks like us that the names of the kings have been interchanged. There is no

Poros in the given passage, it may be said that Āmbhi became king of the region between the Indus and the Jhelum ; and Poros became king of the land from the Jhelum to the Beās. Peithon was transferred from Sind to Bactria. From silence about Sind it may be inferred that Sind was no more a part of the Macedonian empire. After the decree of Tripāradeisus no other decree of the Macedonian empire refers to any Indian dominions. It seems that soon after this time India slipped out of the Macedonian control.

While weak succession to the throne of the Macedonian empire after Alexander and internecine struggle amongst his generals had placed the Indian satrapies of the Macedonian empire out of the control of the central authority of the empire, some circumstances were at work, which made it impossible even for Indian garrisons and officers of Alexander to exercise an effective control over these parts of the empire. The Greek soldiers of the Indian garrisons must have found it very undesirable to live in these distant parts in those days when communication with their families and countries would have been so difficult. Bereft of even their fellow-soldiers, most of whom would have died in deseases and wars and would have returned to their homeland, they should have left India for their country at the very first opportunity especially during the confusion which followed Alexander's death. Even at the time Alexander had reached only Ekbatana, the Thessalian cavalry and some other Grecian allies, having refused to go forward, had returned home.[1] From Bactra Alexander had to send home probably some more Thessalians.[2] At last the soldiers

---

difficulty in supposing the addition of Sind to the dominions of Poros and thus speaking of the later as ruling over the territories lying along the Indus. But in this case, how can be explained the reference to Taxila to be on the Hydaspes ?

1. Arrian, III, 19. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 126, fn. 1.

2. Arr., V, 27. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 120. M'Crindle appears to suggest that here there may be a reference to the same return of the Thessalian army as given just above and difference in the place of return may be

were so desirous of returning to their home-land that Alexander had to cancel his scheme of conquest beyond the river Beās.[1] While Alexander was wounded in the fight with the Mallois and the Oxydrakais in the Punjab, it was rumoured that he had died. On this, the Greek soldiers, who had been recently drafted by the king into settlements around Bactra, revolted under Athenodorus and later under Biton 'not so much from an ambition to reign as from a wish to return to their native country.' Many of these Greeks actually ran away to their homes.[2]

Moreover, the garrisons of Alexander were composed, apart from the Asiatics and Macedonians, of the mercenaries from other states of Greece, who were jealous of the Macedonians. The story of two boxers, Athenian Diaxippus and Macedonian Horratus, shows that there was keen rivalry between these two sections in the camp of Alexander.[3] According to Diodoros, Alexander was so much irritated by frequent revolts of the Greek mercenaries that he once asked all his commanders and satraps throughout India to dismiss them.[4] We are informed that the satrap Philippos was killed not by the natives but by these mercenaries[5]. After the death of Alexander there occurred the Lamian War between Macedonia and some other rebellious states of Greece, jealous of her power. This war must have found repercussions even in the Indian garrisons containing the soldiers of these nationalities. We are actually told that 13,000 Greek mercenaries in Bactria, who were home-sick and simmering with mutiny even before Alexander's death, rose on the news of his death; and were joined by their compatriots

---

due to a slip of memory on the part of Koinos, who in his reply to Alexander's speech before his soldiers on the Beās, mentioned going home of some Thessalians from Bactra. Tarn says that return of the Thessalians from Bactra is wrong (Alex., II, 1950, p. 290).

1. Arr., V, 25-28. M'Crindle, pp. 121-123.
2. Curtius, IX, 7. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 247-248. See also Diod., XVII, 99. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 289.
3. Curt., IX, 7. Cf. M'Crindle, Inv. Alex., pp. 249 ff.; Diod., XVII, 101. Cf. M'Crindle, pp. 290 ff.
4. Diod., XVII, 106. M'Crindle, pp. 299-300.
5. Arr., VI, 27. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 177.

from the other far eastern provinces. Together they formed a veteran army of 20,000 foot and 3,000 horse, whose purpose was to go home and rejoin their own people fighting a war of liberation against the Macedonians.[1]

Besides rivalry between the Greeks and the Macedonians, the Macedonian soldiers and satraps themselves were divided in several factions. The generals of Alexander, who fought after his death for possession over the parts of his empire, were divided into several groups having their respective following among Macedonian soldiers and officers of India. Some of these soldiers and officers might have been much more devoted to their groups, rather than to Macedonian empire in India, which they must have left to join their groups in the west. We hear of certain instances of some such cases. With the death of Antipater in the spring of 319 B. C., the Macedonian empire broke in parts and Polyperchon, the new regent, had hardly any considerable influence outside Greece. At this time Eumenes and Antigonous were the real authorities in Asia, and they engaged in a war with each other since the summer of 318 B. C. We are told that at this time Eudamos, a partisan of Eumenes, left the Punjab forever with 120 elephants of an Indian king whom he assassinated,[2] and died fighting for his leader. Peithon of Sind similarly joined Antigonus; was appointed satrap of Babylon; and ultimately fell fighting by the side of Demitros, the successor of Antigonus, at the battle of Gaza (312 B. C.).[3]

All these factors must have given an opportunity for freedom to the native princes of India who were too proud and warlike to brook for long the burden of foreign thraldom.

1. W. W. Tarn, Anc. Camb. Hist., Vol. VI, pp. 455-6.

2. Diod., XIV, 44, 7. Diodoros (XIV, 14) informs us that Eudamos left the Punjab with 3,000 foot, 500 horse and 120 elephants, and further that he got the elephants by treacherously murdering Poros after Alexander's death. It has been, however, suggested that the text is corrupt and the Raja referred to may have been Taxiles.

3. Diod., XIX, 85, 2.

Alexander had certainly imposed his sovereignty upon them, but it was after a very tough warfare at numerous places. Even while he was present in India, the Brāhmaṇas encouraged the Indians to rise against him.[1] Just after his departure the Indians had become so unruly that they compelled Nearchus to take up his anchors before the scheduled time.[2] There is no record of the details of their activities against the Macedonian empire in India, but in a passage Justin informs us that ultimately under a leader named Sandrokottos they put an end to the Macedonian empire and established an empire of their own.[3] When at last about 305 B.C. Seleucus tried to reconquer the Greek satrapies of the east, he found the Indians under Sandrokottos too strong to bring them under his subjection again.[4]

6. EFFECTS ON INDIA

Thus in the words of Vincent Smith, "All his (Alexander's) proceedings prove conclusively that he intended permanent annexation of those provinces to his empire, and the measures which he took for the purpose were apparently adequate to ensure success. But Alexander's premature death destroyed the fruits of his well-planned and successful enterprise. Within three years of his departure, his officers had been ousted, his garrisons destroyed, and almost all trace of his rule had disappeared. The colonies which he founded in India, unlike those established in the other Asiatic provinces, took no root. The campaign, although carefully designed to secure a permanent conquest, was in actual effect no more than a brilliantly successful raid on a gigantic scale, which left upon India no mark save the horrid scars of bloody war.

---

1. Plutarch, Life of Alex., Chap. LIX. Cf M'Crindle, p. 306. See also Arr., VI, 16-17. Cf. M'Crindle, pp., 159-160.

2. See M'Crindle, p. 396.

3. Justin, XV, 4, Cf. M'Crindle pp. 327-328.

4. Ibid. For the other authorities see the next chapter.

"India remained unchanged. The wounds of battle were quickly healed; the ravaged fields smiled again as the patient oxen and no less patient husbandmen resumed their interrupted labours; and the places of slain myriads were filled by the teeming swarms of a population, which knows no limit save those imposed by the cruelty of men, or the still more pitiless operations of nature. India was not Hellenised, she continued to live the life of 'splendid isolation' and soon forgot the passing of the Macedonian storm. No Indian author—Hindu, Buddhist, or Jain—makes even the faintest allusion to Alexander or his deeds."[1]

Vincent Smith is, of course, correct to say that Alexander's short-lived conquest failed to Hellenise India. He is correct also to say that the Indian writers do not even once mention Alexander. However, it does not mean that Alexander made no effect on India. Ancient Indian writers had little interest in historical events. Many historians firmly believe that the lesson in empire-building taught by Alexander was never lost upon the Indians, who, under Chandragupta Maurya, not only maintained his empire but also extended it to other parts of the country. Henceforward imperial system became a permanent feature of the Indian polity. Many scholars think that Alexander and his successors could not hold and Hellenise India, but they held and Hellenised all other parts of the Achaemenid empire driving out the Persian artists and officers working there to India where they Persianised the empire built up by Chandragupta Maurya. Later on the Graeco-Bactrians, the Parthians and the Scythians, coming from these Hellenised regions, conquered India, and, in a way fulfilling the mission of Alexander, *held in abeyance by the Mauryas, gave a new direction and* stimulus to her civilization. For a discussion of all this let us pass on to the next chapters.

1. EHI, IV, p. 117.

CHAPTER IV

THE MAURYAS

1. CHANDRAGUPTA MAURYA

The origin and early life of Chandragupta Maurya, the founder of the Mauryan empire, is shrouded in mystery. The earliest Indian tradition preserved in the Purāṇas is silent on this point. It merely says that Kauṭilya placed Chandragupta on the throne of Magadha in place of the Nandas. In the Brāhmaṇical literature only the commentaries of the Purāṇas, the dramatic works like the Mudrārākshasa, and the collections of stories like the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Brihatkathā-mañjarī relate Chandragupta Maurya to the family of the Nandas of Magadha. Similarly the early Buddhist canons never refer to Chandragupta Maurya. Only the commentaries on them, redacted also in the works like the Dīpavaṁsa, the Mahāvaṁsa and the Mahābodhivaṁsa, say that Chandragupta, belonging to the Moriyas of the Himalayan region, was made king of Magadha by Chāṇakya. The Jain canons also are mum about this king. Only their commentaries, together with the Mahāpariśishṭaparvan based on them, inform that he came of a village-community of the royal peacock-tamers living in the Vindhya mountains. All the commentaries and other works, giving information about Chandragupta Maurya, are very late. They were written centuries after Chandragupta for religious edification or entertainment. In the name of history they deal only in unreliable cock-bull stories. They contradict one another even on broad basic points. It is ludicrous to attempt any history of Chandragupta Maurya on their basis. There is nothing historisal in them.

Fortunately there is some more reliable information about Chandragupta Maurya, identified with Sandrokottos, in comparatively much more reliable Classical histories. The greatest details are found in a passage from Justin, "Seleucus Nicator waged many wars in the east after the partition of Alexander's empire among his generals. He first took Babylon, and then with his forces augmented by victory subjugated the Bactrians. He then passed over into India, which after Alexander's death, as if the yoke of servitude had been shaken off from its neck, had put his prefects to death. Sandrokottos was the leader who achieved their freedom, but after his victory he forfeited by his tyranny all title to the name of liberator, for he oppressed with servitude the very people whom he had emancipated from foreign thraldom. He was bo n in humble life but was prompted to aspire to royalty by an omen significant of an august destiny. For when, by his insolent behaviour he had offended Alexandrum,[1] and was ordered by that king to be put to death, he sought safety by a speedy flight. While he lay down overcome with fatigue and had fallen into a deep sleep, a lion of enormous size approaching the slumberer licked with its tongue the sweat which oozed profusely from his body, and when he awoke, quietly took its departure. It was this prodigy which first inspired him with the hope of winning the throne, and so having collected a band of robbers, he instigated the Indians to overthrow the existing government. When he was thereafter preparing to attack Alexander's prefects, a wild elephant of monstrous size approached him, and kneeling submissively like a tame elephant received him on to its back and fought vigorously in front of the army. Sandrokottos having thus won

the throne was reigning over India when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleucus having made a treaty with him and otherwise settled his affairs in the east, returned home to prosecute the war with Antigonus."[1]

Inspite of a good deal of mythology and vagueness, it is clear from this passage that Chandrgupta Maurya was born in an ordinary family. He rose to the position of a great king by dint of his own merit and ambition. At the time of Alexander's invasion he was living in north-western India. He met Alexander probably with a view to advancement through him. But his boldness displeased Alexander and he left the latter's company. From Plutarch also we learn that Chandragupta had seen Alexander and that he was only a young man at that time. Plutarch also informs that after his meeting with Alexander Chandragupta "used to declare that Alexander could easily have taken possession of the whole country since the king was hated and despised by his subjects for the wickedness of his disposition and the meanness of his origin."[2] If all this be correct, it means that from very young age Chandragupta was a keen politician. He was looking for fishing in the troubled waters brought about by Alexander's invasion. Probably he wanted Alexander to advance in the vast Gangetic valley, and, exhausting himself thoroughly, to leave for Chandragupta in ruins not only the Achaemenid empire but also the kingdoms of northern India. Alexander, however, proved too shrewd to play into his hands.

But soon an opportunity presented itself before Chandragupta. Alexander died suddenly while returning from India without any heirs. There ensued a fierce war of succession among his generals involving even Alexander's governors in India.

The Macedonian officers and garrisons found it difficult at this juncture to hold themselves against numerous warlike

1. Justin, XV, 4. M'Crindle, op. cit., pp. 327-328.
2. Plutarch, Life of Alexander, LXII. M'Crindle, op. cit., p. 311.

principalities and freedom-loving Brāhmaṇas of India. Chandragupta, working on the side of these principalities and Brāhmaṇas, seized power from the Macedonians and later established his own rule over all this region.

According to Justin an important event of Sandrokottos' career, after becoming the king of north-western India, was his fight against Seleucus. The latter, although comparatively young, was one of the greatest generals of Alexander and had accompanied him in his campaigns upto India. After the death of Alexander and assumption of the regency by Perdikkas, he was appointed to the command of the Companion cavalry. Dissatisfied with Perdikkas, Seleucus was instrumental in his assassination (321 B. C.) while engaged with him in a war against Ptolemy, one of the generals of Alexander who had firmly established himself in Egypt. Then Seleucus favoured the regency of Antipater who, on being regent, made Seleucus the satrap of Babylon by the decree of Triparadeisus (321 B. C.). After the death of Antipater, the regency of the Macedonian empire fell to Polyperchon during whose term of office Antigonus and Eumenes freely fought against each other for supremacy in Asia. Seleucus helped Antigonus, but after his victory Antigonus tried to get rid of this brilliant general, and Seleucus had to leave Babylon to join Ptolemy in Egypt, who was afraid of Antigonus, now the supreme sovereign of the whole Asiatic Macedonian empire, and was opposing him with Cassander who ruled in Hellas and Macedonia, and with Lyssimachus who was carving out a kingdom in Thrace and Asia Minor. In 312 B. C. Seleucus re-occupied Babylon with a body of only one thousand men. He had now to strengthen his position as soon as possible while Antigonus was busy in the west with Ptolemy. So Seleucus employed his great abilities in annexing the eastern provinces of the Macedonian empire. By 302 B. C., after nine years of successful warfare, his empire extended to the Jaxartes in one direction, and to the

confines of the Punjab in the other. It was during this campaign that he came into contact with Chandragupta in India. It must be remembered in this connection that at this time Antigonus was engaged in a mortal struggle with Ptolemy, Cassander and Lyssimachus in the west. Seleucus had immediately to come to this scene of action for his share in the western territories, and he was urgently in need of avoiding wars in the east and of getting most possible war-material from there. At this time he was hardly in a position to oust Sandrokottos from the Indian satrapies of Alexander's empire.

Unfortunately the Classical writers do not give us full and clear details of the war of Sandrokottos against Seleucus. Without providing us with any more information, Justin says only this much that Seleucus concluded a treaty with Chandragupta and settled the affairs of the east with him.

One other Classical writer, Appian, also informs us that Chandragupta fought against Seleucus while he lived near the Indus and so probably before he had penetrated further east into the interiors of India. This writer gives even the information that before a treaty between Chandragupta and Seleucus there was a war, and that the treaty was confirmed by a marriage alliance contracted after it, "And having crossed the Indus, he (Seleucus) warred with Androkottos, the king of the Indians, who dwelt about that river, until he entered into an alliance and a marriage affinity (kedos) with him."[1]

Plutarch supplies us with the information that Sandrokottos presented 500 elephants to Seleucus.[2]

---

1. Syriake, C. 55. Cf. M'Crindle, Op. Cit., pp. 404-405.
2. Plutarch, Alex., 62.

More important details are given by Strabo who says, "along the Indus are Paropamisadae about whom lies Paropamisus mountain, then towards the south the Arachoti, then next towards the south the Gedroseni with the other tribes that occupy the seaboard, and the Indus lies latitudenally alongside all these places, and of these places in part, some that lie along the Indus, are held by Indians, although they formerly belonged to the Persians. Alexander took these away from the Arians and established settlements of his own but Seleucus Nicator gave them to Sandrokottos upon terms of inter-marriage (epigamia) and of receiving in exchange 500 elephants."

We are further informed that "The Indus river was the boundary between India and Ariana of which latter was situated next to India on the west and was in the possession of the Persians at that time (*i.e.*at the time of Alexander's invasion); for later the Indians also held much of Ariana having received it from the Macedonians."[1]

It will be seen that the Classical writers do not give us any detailed record of the actual conflict between Seleucus and Chandragupta. As a matter of fact except Appian none of them refers even to any warfare. They merely speak of the results. There can be no doubt that the invader was hardly in a position to make much headway against Chandragupta, who was well established by this time, and that he concluded an alliance with him which was cemented by a marriage contract. Seleucus was urgently called upon in the west to fight Antigonus. So he might have gladly received 500 war elephants from Chandragupta and recognised his kingship upto the territories lying just to the west of the Indus which formerly had formed certain satrapies of Alexander.

The date of the Indian campaign of Seleucus is generally taken to be about 305 B. C., although it is not known

1 Geography, XV, 2, 9.

directly. Diodoros[1] informs us that going west-ward from the Punjab, Seleucus reached Cappadocia in the winter of 302-301 B. C. This march must have occupied him for about two or three years. So he should have started from India about 305 B. C. Chandragupta must have already been king by this date. On the basis of the dates of Alexander and Seleucus his reign should approximately be placed in the last quarter of the fourth century B. C.

Now after establishing his kingdom over north-western India and after adding some trans-Indus regions to it, Sandrokottos brought even some other parts of India under his rule. Justin's statement that he was "in possession of India" may be taken to refer only to his kingdom in the north-west. But Plutarch tells us that "Androkottos, who had by that time mounted the throne, presented Seleucus with five hundred elephants and overran and subdued the whole of India with an army of 600,000 men."[2] Most probably it means that having settled his problems in the west, Chandragupta conquered some other parts of the country. Megasthenes who lived with Seleucus Nikator, and also with Sibyrtios, the satrap of Arachosia, probably as an ambassador of Seleucus, and who was sent by Seleucus as an embassy to Chandragupta, describes the latter having the title of Palimbothra, indicative of his kingship of the surrounding countries called *Prasii*, that is, Magadha. This shows that before Megasthenes came to Pāṭaliputra, Chandragupta had conquered even the Gangetic valley, and 'had shifted his capital from some place on the Indus to Pāṭaliputra. Indian tradition also is unanimous on the point that Chandragupta became king of Magadha.

The second century Junāgaṛh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman specifically mentions Chandragupta Maurya,

---

1. Diod., XX, pp.113-114.
2. Life of Alex., LXII. Cf. M'Crindle, p. 310.

and refers to the construction of a big dam by his local officer. It means that western India also was included in the empire of Chandragupta which was governed through the local officers who took care of the things like irrigation.

Megasthenes, who came to India in the time of Chandragupta Maurya, wrote an account of India only some fragments of which, quoted by later writers, are available to-day. Among these the fragments giving valuable information about Chandragupta's administration are now thought to be unauthentic.[1] The rest of them give little information for the history of Chandragupta.

According to an Indian tradition one Kauṭilya initiated a work on a school of polity (Arthaśāstra). In fact an Arthaśāstra belonging to the school of Kauṭilya and redacted by Vishṇugupta has come to light. Very late tradition identifies this Kauṭilya with Kauṭilya or Chāṇakya who made Chandragupta king of Magadha. A still later tradition identifies Vishṇugupta himself with Kauṭilya or Chānakya. It is difficult to believe all this. The Arthaśāstra, as we have it to-day, is obviously too late a work to be utilized for the history of Chandragupta Maurya. At best all these traditions may be taken to mean that Chandragupta got compiled a code for the administration of his empire which laid the foundation of statecraft in India.[2]

2. BINDUSĀRA

Chandragupta Maurya was succeeded by his son generally known as Bindusāra, who must have ruled in the first part of the third century B. C. There is little reliable information about this king from any source. However, he

---

1. R. C. Majumdar, JAOS, 1958, pp. 273-276 and the *Class. Accts. of India*, Append. I, pp. 461-473.

2. See the author's articles IHQ, 1952, pp. 265 ff ; Northern India Patrika, Sunday Magzine, 3-12-67 ; and J.I.H., 1967.

appears to have continued his contact with the Hellenistic kingdoms situated in the west. From Strabo[1] we learn that the king of Syria, Seleucus or his son Antiochos, despatched to Allitrochades, the son of Sandrokottos, an ambassador named Deimachos. Pliny[2] tells us that (Ptolemy II) Philadelphos, king of Egypt (B. C. 285-247), sent an envoy named Dionysios to India. Dr. Smith points out that due to the long reign of Ptolemy it is uncertain whether Dionysios presented his credentials to Bindusāra or to his son and successor, Aśoka. It is, however, significant that while Greek and Latin writers refer to Chandragupta and his son Amitraghāta they do not mention Aśoka. As Dr. Raychaudhuri[3] points out, this is rather inexplicable, if an envoy, whose writings were utilized by later authors, really visited the third of the great Mauryas. Patrokles[4], an officer who served under both Seleucus and his son, sailed at this time in the Indian seas and collected much geographical information which Strabo and Pliny were glad to utilize. Athenaios tells an anecdote of private friendly correspondence between Antiochos (I, Soter), King of Syria, and Bindusāra which indicates that Indian monarch communicated with his Hellenistic contemporaries on terms of equality and friendliness. We are told on authority of Hegesander that Amitrochates (Bindusāra), the king of the Indians, wrote to Antiochos asking that king to buy and send him sweet wine, dried figs and a sophist; and Antiochos replied, "We shall send you the figs and the wine, but in Greece the laws forbid a sophist to be sold."[5] In connection with the demand for a Greek sophist it is interesting to recall the statement of

1. Geogr., II, 1, 9.

2. M'Crindle, *Ancient India as Described in the Classical Literature*, p. 108, Nat. Hist., VI, 17.

3. H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 5, p. 299.

4. Smith, Aśoka, 3rd. ed., p. 19.

5. M'Crindle, Inv. Alex., p. 409.

Diodoros[1] that one Iamboulos was carried to the king of Palimbothra (Paṭaliputra) who had great love for Grecians

3 AŚOKA

Bindusara was followed by his son Aśoka who became one of the greatest kings of India rather of the whole world As Aśoka became a very great patron of Buddhism and as Buddhism became a world religion through his activities, the vast Buddhist literature spread over the whole of Asia has preserved large accounts of his These accounts are however legends fabricated by very late ecclesiastics Most of them relate to acts of religious nature and contain little information of historical value The Brahmanical and Jain literatures furnish still less reliable information about Aśoka

Besides being celebrated in voluminous literature Aśoka figures mostly as 'Devanampiya Piyadasi Laja, in a number of rock and pillar inscriptions scattered all over India There are in all some thirty five records of varying length and importance many of them available in different versions They are the earliest fully trustworthy historical records of India and they supply the most reliable information for the history of Aśoka

From these inscriptions we learn that in the ninth year of his reign Aśoka conquered the country of Kalinga through a great sanguinary war in which hundred and fifty thousand persons were brought as captives from Kalinga, one hundred thousand were slain, and many times as many died[2] It means that Aśoka was capable of organizing a huge army of many hundred thousand soldiers, to put it in field hundred of miles away in hostile lands and to lead it to success in the face of a formidable enemy But this gentle hearted great organizer and commander was not capable of bearing the sight of pain and misery caused by this war to mill ons of innocent people In the place of exaltation and pride he

1. D od., H st., II. Cf. M'Crindle p 205

2 RE XIII

was moved by pity and repentence. So much so that he left war completely for the remaining twenty years of his life and devoted his great energies to the welfare of all living beings. On political considerations also, by conquering Kalinga the empire reached its logical boundaries. Consolidation and emotional integration alone were its further requirements.

The inscriptions give a fair idea of the extension of Aśoka's empire. They have been found from many places in Kābul, Kandahār, Pakistan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rājasthān, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Surāshṭra, Kāthiāwaṛ, Mahārāshṭra, Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Madras. Inclusion of all these states in the Aśokan empire is further corroborated by some statements in the inscriptions themselves. They mention the Seleucid empire covering Iran, Afghanistan and Baluchistan in the west; and Choḍas (the Kāverī valley), Pāṇḍyas and Keralaputras (the apex of the Indian Peninsula) and Tāmraparṇis (Ceylon ?) in the south as frontier states.[1] Kambojas (North West Frontier Province), Gandhāras (the Kābul valley), Rathikas (Mahārāshṭra), Bhojas (Berar) and Āndhras (the lower Godāwarī-Krishṇā valley) among others have been described to be within the empire.[2]

The whole empire was under the control of the king who, however, together with his officials, worked hard in truly missionary spirit for the welfare of not only his subjects, but for that of all living beings according to ancient Indian religious and philosophical rather than political and practical ideas. In addition to overall supervision of the whole empire he was in direct charge of Magadha[3] with its capital at Pāṭaliputra. Other parts of the empire were under some prince-governors residing at Takshaśilā,[4] Ujjayini[5] and probably

1. RE XIII and II.

2. RE V and XIII.

3. Bhabru Edict and RE V mention Aśoka only as the king of Magadha.

4-5. Kalinga Ed I.

also at Tosali[1] in Orissa and Suvarnagiri[2] in Mysore. The king as well as the prince-governors were helped by numerous high officials known as Mahâmātras.[3] Some other Mahâmātras, living in big cities, which had sprung in religious, political and economic centres like Kauśāmbī, Sārnâth, Isilâ, Samāpā, and Sāñchi, looked independently after the local administration of large areas in their jurisdiction. The rājukas[4] were probably district (janapada) officers with the pulisas[5] working under them probably in the smaller units of the districts. The inscriptions refer to some other officers like yutas,[6] pradesikas[7] etc. whose duties are not known. The king sent instructions inscribed on stones and commissions of high officers for guiding the local officers.[8] The prince-governors also did the same.[9] The local officers also went on tour.[10] There are references to prisoners and capital sentence.[11] Main source of the income of the state appears to be cesses and taxes (bali) and king's share of produce (ashṭabhāga).[12] The inscriptions mention popular assemblies (parishas) and corporations (nikāyas[13]) without giving any specific information about them. Imperialism probably gave impetus to trade and commerce whose development increased the use of roads, planting of shady trees and construction of watering and resting places which attracted the

---

1. Kalinga Edict II.
2. Siddapur MRE I.
3. RE XII, MRE I, Kalinga Ed. II, Kauśāmbī and Sārnāth Pillar Edicts.
4. RE III and PE IV and VII.
5. PE I, IV and VII.
6-7. RE III.
8. Kalinga Edict I.
9. Ibid.
10. RE III.
11. PE V and IV.
12. Lumbini PE.
13. RE I and IV and PE V.

benevolence of Aśoka.[1] It is noteworthy that all these features are found in the administration of Darius I also. Even atleast one of the high officers of Aśoka, Tushāspa of Kāthiāwaṛ, said to be a foreigner (Yavana), is a Persian to judge by his name.

In accordance with life in ancient India the general outlook of these inscriptions, which are actually named Dhammalipi, is mainly religious. Being inclined towards the humanistic revolution of the sixth century B. C., they deprecate bloody sacrifices and rituals[2] based on blind belief. They ask people to follow the simple ethical principles of compassion, liberality, truthfulness, purity, gentleness, love of sacred law, circumspection, obedience, fear, energy etc. and seemly behaviour towards one another especially towards the Śramaṇas, Brāhmaṇas, parents, venerable men, aged persons, slaves, servants, poor and wretched people.[3] All this was thought necessary for happiness in this and in the next world.

Buddhism was the most promising and most popular expression of humanistic revolution in India, and through conviction or diplomacy or both Aśoka subscribed to it.[4] He had best regards for the Buddhist trio: the Buddha, the dhamma and the Samgha.[5] He had undertaken pilgrimages of the Buddhist sacred places[6] and had built Buddhist stūpas.[7] He was anxious for maintaining the unity of the Buddist Samgha and had issued orders to his Mahāmātras to be strict in this matter.[8] The dhamma so vigorously propagated by him is

1. PE VI and RE IX.
2. PE VII.
3. RE III, IX and XIII, PE I *to* VII, and *MRE II.*
4. MRE I.
5. Bhabru Edict.
6. Lumbini and Nigliva PE.
7. Nigliva PE
8. Sārnāth, Sāñchi and Kauśāmbi Pillar Edicts on Schism.

perhaps none but Buddhism of his time. But inspite of all this we find no taint of Buddhist bigotry in Aśoka. He had said that basic elements of all the religions is the same and, showing equal respect for all religions, everyone should emphasize the underlying common principles of all religions.[1] Aśoka has always preached to show respect not only to Buddhist Śramanas but also to Brāhmaṇas, Ājīvikas and Nirgranthas. His Dharma mahāmātras cared for all of them[2] and his caves on Barābara Hills donated to the Ājīvikas bear eloquent testimony to his generosity flowing beyond the narrow limits of Buddhism. There were several religions at the time, each one of them having crores of adherents all over the empire. As a king of all this extensive region, impossible to control by force of arms in those times, Aśoka could hardly afford to neglect anyone of them.

The whole atmosphere represented by the inscriptions of Aśoka smacks of a backward political and social system dominated by religious mentality of India. Even as a king Aśoka was mainly interested in charities to the religionists, in small works of public utility, and in maintenance as well as spread of traditional religious principles and customs, all productive of religious merit for the next world. Probably Aśoka had become or was trying to become acclimatized to Indian idea of kingship established firmly all over his widespread dominions for hundreds of years. In those days, wholly devoid of all means of communications and social education, Aśoka could hardly change or even resist the deeply rooted ideas of his far-flung innumerable subjects.

Aśoka's vision was not confined only to India. At least one passage[3] in his inscriptions refers to his contact with the western world. In this passage he says that his religious

1. RE XII and VII.
2. PE VII.
3. RE XIII.

missions had gone "as far as at (the distance of) six hundred yojanas, where the Yona king named (Antiyoka) (is ruling) and beyond this Antiyoka (where) four kings (are ruling), (viz. the king) named Turumaya, (the king) named Antikini, (the king) named Maka (and the king) named Alikasundara." The kings mentioned here have been identified respectively with Antiochus I Soter of Syria (280-261 B. C.) or his son Antiochos II Theos (261-246 B. C.), Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt (285-247 B. C.), Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia (276-239 B. C.), Magas of Cyrene (c. 300-c. 250 B. C.), and Alexander of Epirus (272-255 B. C.) or Alexander of Corinth (252-244 B. C.). Pointing out to complete absence of any reference to Aśokan missionaries in the western literature, Rhys Davids has thrown doubt on the correctness of this passage.[1] But most probably these missionaries small in number worked among the common people. It is not necessary for them to attract the attention of the Classical writers, who were interested only in princely courts. From the dates of the western contemporaries of Aśoka his reign can safely be inferred to be in the middle of the third century B. C.

4. PERSIAN INFLUENCE

Besides the inscriptions, there is some more archaeological evidence for the history of Aśoka. It shows clearly that the most of the equipments of Aśokan imperialism had been borrowed from Persia. It is no place for going into the details of this question here. It is, however, difficult to resist the temptation of quoting briefly on this point from a recent work of Sir Martimer Wheeler, the greatest living authority on India archaeology :—

"I have already suggested (p. 24) the likelihood that at the end of the 6th century B. C., when Achaemenid Persia acquired its Indian province, Persia supplied India, not

1. Buddhist India, pp. 195 6.

merely with administrators, but also with new materials and ideas: above all, with the use of iron, which now appears in India for the first time, and the idea of a currency, which was minted at Taxila in native guise but on Persian standards, and emerged in the Ganges basin in or shortly after the 5th century B. C. Persia moreover lent India the Aramaic alphabet which, with Aramaic speech, had been the official medium of communication throughout the Achaemenid empire. In India script was modified to suit the local Prākrit language and, as Kharoṣṭhī, was used by Ashoka for his inscriptions in the north-west. Even as far south as Brahmagiri, the Ashokan scribe has added a word in this alien Kharoṣṭhī, though elsewhere in metropolitan India the Brāhmī script was unchallenged.

"But the Persian contribution to India did not end with iron and currency and Kharoṣṭhī. These were the symbols of that new security which advancing imperial rule imposed along the highways, and of a new burgeoning of inter-regional trade. Local capitals which were also caravan-cities sprang up besides the main routes: probably Begram north of Kabul; certainly, as recent work has shown, Chārasada (Pushkalāvatī or 'Lotus City') on the Peshāwar plain; and far-famed Taxila in the Punjab. These derelict and dusty sites are memorials to the pax Persica of the later half of the 6th century B. C. And two centuries later, when Alexander the Great brought his travel-stained troops to the Indus, he came as the successor to the Great King of Persia, whose empire he had grasped. He came to claim the Achaemenid province of India; albeit that, his curiosity ever marched ahead of him, and his horizon was a mirage. But in the long view what mattered to India was less the arrival of Alexander than the destruction of the Persian power. Under the Achaemenid emperors, the arts and crafts—particularly but not only those of architecture—had achieved resplendent distinction. With the burning of

Persepolis in 330 B. C., two centuries of royal patronage came to an abrupt end. The accumulated artistry of Persia was out of work.

"The successor-empire, to which Alexander and his heir Seleukos pointed the way, was that of Chandragupta and his Mauryas. Here was the greatest empire that India had ever produced, greater than that of the Indus valley two thousand years previously. Here was the patronage of a dynasty with, as yet, no confirmed artistic tradition of its own in any way comparable with its wealth and its ambition. Here was a new home for the accomplished artists and craftsmen of Persia. And hither they came.

"It is not an exaggeration to say that this Indo-Persian phase marks the beginning of masonry architecture in India. There had of course been stone and brick buildings far back in the 3rd millennium, the earliest stone structures in India to which an approximate date can be attached are the remnants of the great defences of Old Rājgir in Bihār......These rugged structures, too, can scarcely claim the name of architecture. Nor can those of the early Taxila in the Punjab, visited though it was by Alexander in 326 B. C.........The general culture of the city was of the same inferior order: only at the end of the 4th century, at or shortly after the arrival of Alexander, do considerable hoards of sophisticated jewellery, including three superb gems of Achaemenian workmanship, enliven the monotony of the scene. It is likely enough that these hoards were either Persian loot brought to Taxila by Alexander's following, or were otherwise a sequel to the devastation of the Persian empire and the dispersal of Achaemenian craftsmanship.

"Indeed, in 'Aryan' India the term 'architecture' can first be applied unreservedly to the famous sandstone columns, once more than thirty in number, which Ashoka set up as memorials after his conversion to Buddism, and on

some of which he subsequently carved his pious injunctions to his subjects. It has long been recognized that these columns, without precedent in Indian architectural forms, represent in partibus the craftsmanship of Persia. Actually, the name 'Percepolitan' which is commonly given to them by writers on Indian architecture is not altogether happy, since the innumerable columns of Persepolis are invariably fluted, whereas those of Ashoka are unfluted, as indeed was the normal Persian custom. But if for 'Persepolitan' we substitute 'Persian' or, better still, 'Achaemenid', there can be no dispute. The Chunār sandstone from which Ashoka's columns are wrought is superbly carved and is finished with a lustrous polish of a kind which in India is characteristic of no other age. This is a Persian accomplishment; the masonary of the palaces of Darius and Xerxes 'goes to the extreme of highly polished stones, looking, when well preserved, like mirrors of black marble. Equally Persian are the famous lions which crowned the Ashokan column at Sārnāth, near Banaras, and have been assumed as the Republican badge of India. The setting-up of memorial or religious pillars (of wood) was indeed an Indian, not a Persian, habit, but the Ashokan form and craftsmanship are a completely alien rendering of this tradition. And, once established in India by the Great Buddhist emperor, the Achaemenid column, with its bell-shaped lotus capital and with or without its animal impost, entered into the fabric of Indian architecture and was reproduced, in modified forms, by architects or rock-carvers, Buddhist and others, for several centuries after Ashoka.

"The mention of rock-carvers recalls another debt of Ashoka's to Persian prototypes. From the 7th century B.C. if not earlier, tombs in the likeness of pillared halls had been cut into the cliffs of Media and Persia. In India, the first of a long and distinguished series of rock-cut 'structures' were carved in the time of Ashoka out of the hard gneiss of

the Barābar hills, nineteen miles north of Gayā in southern Bihār. It is significant that they reproduce wooden buildings; a round hut with a thatched roof, an oblong hall or shrine with a vaulted 'wooden' roof, a monumental doorway imitating bamboo and timber. In other words, the more grandiose Persian idea is adapted to the Indian idiom. At the same time the Persian tradition of polished stonework is faithfully and laboriously followed; the hard granite surface of the interiors of these humble cells has been varnished until it resembles glass or metal.

"Lastly, there can be no doubt that, in carving his precepts upon rocks, Ashoka was once more adapting a Persian precedent. The Bisutun or Behistun rock-inscriptions of Darius I dates from c. 518 B. C.; there is in India no precursor to the rock-edicts cut at the bidding of Ashoka in and after 257 B. C. True that, *save for an occasional* formula, nothing could be more unlike the commemorative and administrative records of the proud Persian despots than the gentle exhortations of the Buddhist emperor. But yet again, as so often, we are confronted with the transmutation of a manifestly inherited idea.

"In one way and another, then, the Mauryan was heir to the Great King. There is, however, an archaeological time-gap in the process of transmission. Persepolis was burned in 330 B.C., and the earliest relevant works of Ashoka shortly ante-date the middle of the 3rd century. What in the interim had happened to the homeless Persian craftsman? I am inclined to think that Megasthenes and Pāṭaliputra, between them, come to the rescue.

"Megasthenes was sent by Seleukos as ambassador to the court of Chandragupta at Pāṭaliputra. Pāṭaliputra he describes as situated at the junction of the Son and Gānges, and as being more than 9 miles long and 1¾ miles wide; in other words, it was stretched out along the bank of the Ganges

in a fashion similar to that of the modern Patna. The city was surrounded by a wooden palisade with loop-holes for archers, and outside the palisade was a wide and deep ditch, which served both as a defence and as a drain. Along the palisade were 570 towers and 64 gates. In the royal palace, as we are told by Aelian, following Megasthenes, there was *much that was 'calculated to excite admiration, and with* which neither Susa, with all its costly splendour, nor Ecbatana, with all its magnificence, can vie. In the parks tame peacocks are kept, and phasants which have been domesticated ; and cultivated plants......and shady groves and pastures planted with trees, and tree branches which the art of the woodman has deftly interwoven......There are also tanks of great beauty in which they keep fish of enormous size quite tame.' The whole description is significantly reminiscent of a Persian paradise.

"Of the splendour that was Pāṭaliputra little is known today in material form, but that little is precisely what we have been led to expect. As long ago as 1896 a summary excavation brought to light a column-capital of a familiar Achaemenid pattern. It has the stepped impost, side-volutes and central palmettes of its Persian prototypes, and its design if not its execution is attributable to an early phase of the transplanted Achaemenid craftsmanship. Two stone legs of a throne of Persian type were also found. Subsequently, in 1912, a more ambitious but still very incomplete excavation seems to have uncovered some part of a large pillared hall, represented by an unframed cluster of some eighty monolithic columns showing the Persian polish. In front of them is a row of massive timber rafts, presumably designed to carry a *platform of monumental staircase over the unstable subsoil.* Inadequate though the evidence be, it is tolerably clear that we have here a Persian dewan or apadana or audience-hall, and that we are confronted once more with a deliberate 'Persianization' that bespeaks the presence of imported ideas and imported master-masons......

who are generally credited with a rule of 137 years with differences in their number, names and order of succession. The Divyāvadāna[1] furnishes the following names in order of succession : Sampadi, Brihaspati, Vrishasena, Pushyadharaman and Pushyamitra. Tāranāth[2] gives another successor Vīrasena who ruled in Gandhāra while the Rājataraṅgiṇī[3] mentions Jalauka as the successor of Aśoka in Kashmir whose dominions are said to extend upto Kānyakubja (Kanauj in U. P.).

It is not possible to reconcile the divergent versions of these different authorities. It has been said[4] that they give different dynasties ruling at different places: the Purāṇas in Magadha and the Divyāvadāna and Tāranāth in the North-West.[5] The difference may be due even to the mistakes in the lists of these very late and mostly legendary works.

Indian archaeology knows of only one successor of Aśoka, 'Devānāmiya' Daśaratha, known from his brief dedicatory inscriptions on the walls of three cave dwellings in Bihar. These caves are near the same number of similar caves of Devānāmpiya Aśoka similarly donated to the monks of the same sect[6].

According to the Purāṇic literature the Maurya kings were followed successively by the kings of Śunga, Kaṇva and Āndhra dynasties. Of these the Āndhras or Sātavāhanas, as known from their coins and inscriptions, were confined to south India. The Kaṇvas are not known from any other source. One or two late Śunga kings figure in certain ins-

1. Divy., Cowell and Neil, p. 433.

2. Tāranāth, Hist. of Buddhism, trans. of Schiefner, pp. 49 ff.

3. Rāj., I, p. 108 f.

4. Lassen, Ind. Alt., II, p. 283 ff.; F. W. Thomas, CHI, p. 512 ; H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 6, pp. 361-2 and others.

5. Vīrasena of Tāranāth has been identified by some scholars with Vrishasena of the Divy. (See F. W. Thomas, CHI, I, p. 512).

6. D. C. Sircar, S. I., pp. 78-80.

criptions found at Besnagar,[1] the old city of Vidiśā, mentioned as the capital of the second Śunga king Agnimitra in the Mālavikāgnimitram. The first Śunga ruler Pushyamitra, described in several more Brāhmanical and legendary Buddhist works of mostly late date, appears to be better known perhaps for overthrowing the Mauryas and for holding together large parts of their empire for some time in the confusion created by the Graeco-Bactrian invasion. The Śungas, at least after their first ruler, appear to be the local kings of Central India ruling from Vidiśā where their reign has been referred to in a short inscription on a railing of the Buddhist stūpa at Bharahut.[2] All this means that the Indian tradition, which gives the names of the kings of central and southern India as the successors of the imperial Mauryas, is not acquainted with the names of the kings who ruled over northern India after the Mauryas. They were foreign to the Indian tradition. For their history known from other sources let us turn to the next chapter.

1. A. S. I., A. R., 1908-9, pp. 126 ff. : and 1913-14, p. 190.
2. D. C. Sircar, S.I., p. 89.

CHAPTER VI

THE INDO-GREEKS

The whole ancient world from the Mediterranean to the Indus was held together in the Achaemenid empire in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. The end of this empire at the hands of Alexander the Great resulted in the establishment of the Hellenistic kingdoms in the west and the Mauryan empire in the east. All these states remained in power throughout the third century B. C. The rise of the Roman empire in the second century B. C. created again a new order in this region. The countries around the Mediterranean were grasped by the Romans. The vast Iranian plateau was left to the Parthians. And the eastern countries fell under the Greeks of Bactria. Pressed by the Parthians from the west and the Scythians from the north, these Greeks later on passed into India defeating the weak successors of Chandragupta Maurya who had turned the tide of Greek conquest from this country. The Greek kings of India may be termed as the Indo-Greeks and their history may be traced from the beginning of the Seleucid empire.

After the death of Alexander the Great, Seleucus Nicator (B. C. 312-281) consolidated his hold from the Mediterranean in the west to Bactria and Parthia in the east. During his reign as also throughout that of his successor, Antiochus I Soter (B. C 281-261), his empire remained intact. But under Antiochus II (B. C. 261-246), notable for his love of luxury and debauchery, the distant border provinces of Parthia and Bactria became independent. Later on Seleucus II (B. C. 246-226), the successor of Antiochus II, and Antiochus III (B. C. 223-187), the successor of Seleucus III (B. C. 226-223), tried in vain to regain these provinces. The crushing defeat of Antiochus III at the hands of Romans not only left these

provinces independent but also free to grow rapidly at the cost of the Seleucids.

1 DIODOTUS

Strangely the Classical literature gives directly little information about the Bactrian revolt against the Seleucids While narrating the early history of Parthia, a few writers happen to say incidentally some thing about Bactria also. Thus Trogus describes the revolt of Bactria only in one sentence, "The Bactrians revolted and Diodoto became their king "[1] In the writings of Strabo there are two sentences on this point ' Those who had been entrusted with their government first caused the revolt of Bactriana and all the country near it .. ..then Arsaces invaded Parthia", and "When in flight from the enlarged power of Diodotus and his followers, he (Arsaces) caused Parthia to rovolt."[2] Justin provides with some more information "After his (Antigonus') death they ('the Parthians with other peoples of Upper Asia') were under the rule of Seleucus Nicator, and then under Antiochus and his successors, from whose great grandson Seleucus they first revolted in the first Punic War when Lucius Marlius Vulso and Marcus Atilius Regulus were consuls[3] At the same period also, Theodotus, governor of the thousand cities of Bactria, revolted, and assumed the title of king, and all the other people of the east, influenced by his example, fell away from the Macedonians One Arsaces (who became king of Parthia) .. ..raised a large army through fear of Seleucus and Theodotus, king of the Bactrians But being soon relieved of his fears by the death of Theodotus, and not long after, engaging with king Seleucus, who came

---

1 Trogus XLI.

2 Strabo XI 9 2-3

3 These were consuls in the year 250 B. C. when Antiochus II (B C 262-246) was Seleucid emperor Justin has placed this revolution in the reign of Seleucus II (B. C. 246-226) by mistake.

to take vengeance on the rebels, he obtained a victory."[1] According to Polybius the children of the Bactrian rebels were killed by Euthydemus who occupied the throne of Bactria.[2]

All this means that during the reign of Antiochus II (B. C. 262-246) a Greek named Diodotus was the governor of the large province of Bactria, having some one thousand cities. About 256 B. C. Diodotus declared his independence and became king of not only Bactria but also of some countries near it. Most probably his kingdom included Sogdia on the east and Margiana on the west. Arsaces, ruling somewhere in this area, fled to Parthia and became its ruler. Here also Arsaces was always on guard against Diodotus. But the latter's death some time before the Parthian invasion of Seleucus II, near about 235 B. C, removed Arsaces' fear from the side of Bactria. Diodotus seems to have left behind only some small children. Putting them to death, Euthydemus seized the throne of Bactria. It is difficult to determine whether this event took place just after the death of Diodotus or it occurred after some young prince, left by Diodotus, had been on the throne for some time.

Some of these events are corroborated by a number of gold, silver and copper coins found all over Margiana, Bactria and Sogdiana with the legend of Diodotus. The earliest of them closely follow the issues of Antiochus II, so much so that they bear the same portrait and the same mint marks.[3] On the basis of difference in the portraits of these coins many

---

1. Justin, XLI, 4. Some scholars interpret a few words of this passage to mean that Diodotus, wrongly named Theodotus, was succeeded by a son of the same name.

2. XI, 84.

3. Macdonald (CHI, I, pp. 435-7) and Tarn (GBI, pp. 72-74) would like to trace the origin of these coins not only to the time of Antiochus II but also to that of Antiochus I, although without much justification (Cf. A. K. Narain, the Indo-Greeks, pp. 14-16).

numismatists have assigned them to two kings, Diodotus I and Diodotus II. But it is difficult to be sure on this point.[1]

2. EUTHYDEMUS

Polybius, the famous Roman historian, is almost the only source of information for the history of Euthydemus. He has, however, given only a few points of it in his description of the eastern campaigns of Antiochus III in three passages. The first passage describes in detail the first encounter between Antiochus III and Euthydemus on the bank of the river Arius near Tapuria in 208 B. C. Euthydemus was guarding with his army the ford on the river to check Antiochus' advance in Bactria. Marching one whole night, Antiochus took his men by surprise and fighting gallantly compelled Euthydemus to retire to his capital at Bactra. The second passage[3] mentions casually the "famous siege of Bactra" lasting for two years by Antiochus III laid in pursuit of Euthydemus. The third passage[4] deals with the treaty between Euthydemus and Antiochus III and the latter's retreat from the east. According to it Euthydemus was originally an inhabitant of the town of Magnesia.[5] Somehow he occupied the throne of Bactria at the cost of children or descendants of Diodotus some time before its invasion by Antiochus. The latter, fed up with his long siege of Bactra at a great distance from his capital, which was threatened by the

1. E. T. Newell, a great authority on the Seleucid coins, assigns all these portaits only to one king (The Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid Mints, p. 243), while some other numismatists (*Macdonald, CHI, I, p. 393*; A. K. Narain, The Indo-Greeks, p 16 etc.) attribute the portrait of an old man on some of them to Diodotus and that of a young man on others to his son of the same name, *Diodotus II.*

2. Polybius, Histories, X, 49.

3. Ibid., XXIX, 6.

4. Ibid., XI, 39.

5. At this time there were two towns bearing this name, one in Ionia and the other in Lydia. Our historians are not in agreement as to which of these Euthydemus belonged.

Romans, ultimately concluded a treaty with Euthydemus accepting his kingship of Bactria. He marched upto the eastern side of the Hindukush where an Indian king named Sophagasenus was ruling, and came back to Syria passing through Arachosia, Drangiana and Carmania.

The last passage leaves little doubt that the kingdom of Euthydemus included Bactria and Margiana. Towards India it was confined to the Hindukush ; and to the south of it the countries just on the western side of the Indus, such as Arachosia, Drangiana and Carmania, were outside it. No writer has ever mentioned Euthydemus in connection with Graeco-Bactrian conquest of India.[1] Nevertheless many historians are inclined to think that not only Arachosia, Drangiana and the Kābul valley but even some parts of the upper Indus valley were conquered during his reign. Probably the idea originated with Alexander Cunningham's collection of some coins bearing the name of Euthydemus all over these countries.[2] But actually all or most of these coins might belong to Euthydemus II.[3] The real issues of Euthydemus I found in this area might have reached there in the course of trade.

3. DEMETRIUS AND MENANDER

The last passage of Polybius describing the events of 206 B. C. has mentioned Demetrius, the son of Euthydemus, as a promising young man. On the basis of the information provided by Apollodorus, Strabo refers to him with Menander as one of the greatest conquerors of India : "The Greeks

1. On the other hand Strabo, the best historian of the Indo-Greek kings, in his longest passage on the conquest of India by the Graeco-Bactrians, quoted below, mentions Euthydemus as the king of the Bactrians.

2. Num. Chr., 1869, pp. 136 ff.

3. See CHI, I, p. 400.

who occasioned its (Bactria's) revolt became so powerful by means of fertility and advantages of the country that they became masters of Ariana and India, according to Apollodorus of Artemita. Their chiefs, particularly Menander, if he really crossed the Hypanis[1] to the east and reached Isamus,[2] conquered more nations than Alexander.' These conquests are achieved partly by Menander, partly by Demetrius, son of Euthydemus, king of the Bactrians. They got possession not only of Patalene[3] but of the kingdom of Saraostus[4] and Sigerdis[5] which constitute the remainder of the coast. Apollodorus, *in short, says that* Bactriana is the ornament of all Ariana., They *extended their empire even* so far as the Seres[6] and Phryne."[7]

According to this passage *Demetrius*[9] and *Menander* conquered a great part of India including the whole of the Indus basin-western Uttar Pradesh, Gujarāt and Mahārāshṭra—many times larger than Bactria itself. It is no wonder then that the western literature knows of Demetrius as the "king of the Indians."[9]

The wide expanse of the dominions of these kings is confirmed by discovery of large numbers of their coins throughout this area. The circulation of Menander's coins in Gujarāt and Mahārāshṭra is verified by the Periplus of the

---

1. Hypanis is the Graeco-Roman name of the river Beās.

2. Isamus has not yet been identified satisfactorily. At one time most of our historians were inclined to identify it with the Son but now they generally favour the Yamunā which may be correct as it is not very far off from the Beās as suggested by this sentence itself. Indo-Greek coins have been found upto the bank of this river.

3. Probably Pātala *on the lower Indus known from some other* sources.

4. Saraostus is most probably a slight corruption of Surāshtra.

5. Sigerdis is perhaps Sāgaradvipa in Sanskrit which is the old name of the island of Kacch. Pliny's Sigerus must be placed nearabout this area.

6. Seres and Phryne are generally placed in Chinese Turkistan.

7. Strabo, XI, 11, 1-2.

8. Against the clear statement of Strabo, Dr. A. K. Narain would like to attribute Indian conquests to Demetrius II on doubtful numismatic evidence.

9. Justin, XLI, 6; Chaucer, Knight's Tale, 2155 ; and Boccaccio, De Casibus Virorum Illustrium.

Erythraean Sea.[1] The coins of Demetrius have been found even in Bactria, Arachosia and Seistan. Bajaur in the Swāt valley has yielded one inscription of Menander on a relic casket.[2] He figures as an important king of India not only in the Classical Graeco-Roman literature[3] but also in a famous Buddhist work, the Milindapanho.[4]

4. EUCRATIDES

Eucratides is perhaps the last Graeco-Bactrian king to be mentioned in the Classical literature. Justin[5] has given important information on his career and achievements. According to him Eucratides started his reign simultaneously with Mithradates I of Parthia who is generally thought to have come on the throne in 171 B. C. He carried on several wars with great vigour in Sogdiana, Aria, Arachosia, Drangiana and India. Demetrius was most probably his principal adversary because he has been stated by Justin to have withstood brilliantly a seige by a large army of Demetrius. According to Justin when Eucratides was returning from his campaigns in India, he was murdered in cold blood by his son whom he had made a joint king.

By discovery of numerous coins of Eucratides in Bactria, Sogdia, Aria, Arachosia, Drangiana, the Kābul valley and the western part of the upper Indus valley it appears that he was very successful against Demetrius. The latter might have been forced to conquer the inner parts of India on being expelled by Eucratides from his western dominions.

1. Para 47. Schoff's transl. p. 47.

2. N. G. Majumdar, Ep. Ind., XXIV, pp. 1-8; Sten Konow, NIA, 1939 40, pp. 639-48; and Ep. Ind., XXVII, pp. 52-58.

3. *Plutarch, Moralia*, 821; Justin, *Prol. Pomp. Trog.*, XLI; *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, p. 47 ; and Strabo, XI, 11, 1.

4. Some scholars find references to him also in the AMMK, the Divyāvadāna, the History of Tāranāth, and Kshemendra's Avadānakalpalatā. An Indo-Chinese tradition associates him with a statue of Buddha in Indo-China.

5. Justin, XLI, 6.

Menander also might have done the same to meet the threat of Eucratides or his successors. In any case Eucratides came to India and conquered a large part of the Indo-Kābul valley. Wth Demetrius and Menandar, Strabo has mentioned him also as a great conqueror of India, "He (Apollodorus) asserts that the Bactrians had subjected to their rule a greater portion of India than the Macedonians, seeing that Eucratides had a thousand cities which acknowledged his authority."[1] Justin also credits him with reducing India to subjection. Eucratides might have been forced into India by the Parthians who are said to have deprived him of his at least two satrapies.[2] By this time the Scythians of Central Asia also were in stir.

5. THE LATER GREEK KINGS

Some thirty five Indo-Greek kings who came after Demetrius, Menander and Eucratides to rule over the Indo-Kābul valley are known only from their coins found all over this area. From the middle of the second century B. C. they ruled for about one hundred years till the arrival of the Indo-Parthians and the Śakas. On the basis of nebulous evidence of their coins several numismatists have tried to locate them in space and time and to find out their relationship with one another. These kings would have been naturally in contact with the kings of inner India. At least one of them, Antialcidas, ruling in the western Punjab or the Kābul valley, is known from an inscription to have ambassadorial contact with an Indian king of Vidiśā in Central India.[3] It is remarkable that the Greek ambassador from Takshaśilā was a *Bhāgavata*. Indian shape, script, language and titles on the later Indo-Greek coins also show a tendency

---

1. Strabo, XV, 1, 3.
2. Ibid., XI, 515-517.
3. D. C. Sircar, SI, p. 90.

towards Indianisation. In course of time the Greeks cut off from their home lands must have been Indianised.

There are only some vague references in the Classical literature that some Greeks penetrated to the interior-most parts of the Gangetic basin.[1] It is difficult to determine whether they were traders and envoys or conquerors.

6. THE YAVANAS

On the other hand ancient Indian literature, although devoid of historical works, definitely refers to the Yavana invasion of the Gangetic basin. Some of these Yavanas[2] might be the Indo-Greeks.

In the Mālavikāgnimitram,[3] a drama by Kālidāsa, it has been said that Vasumitra, the son of Agnimitra, guarded the sacrificial horse let loose by Pushyamitra, the father of Agnimitra. Roaming on the southern (or right) bank of the Sindhu, this horse was caught by the Yavana cavalry. This led to a fight between Vasumitra and the Yavanas in which the former defeated the latter and returned with his horse. The river Sindhu mentioned here has been identified either

---

1. Strabo, XV, 1, 27 23; The Periplus, para 41 (Schoff's trans, p 39); and Pliny, VI, 58

2 The Sanskrit word Yavana has, of course, been used for the foreigners and non Hindus in general (See O Stein, Ind Cult, I, pp 343 ff, Thomas, Modi Memorial Vol, pp. 279 ff, Bhandarkar, *Ind Cult*, 1, *pp 18 19 and* others) As such it cannot be taken invariably to mean the Graeco-Bactrians alone But some scholars are inclined to think that upto the early centuries of the Christian era this word denoted only the Greeks (Rapson, CHI, I, pp 540-41, and Anc. Ind. Cat Coins, Andhras etc, p XXXVII, D.R. Bhandarkar, IA, 1911, pp 12 13, ABORI, VIII, pp 134 ff, and Ind Cult, I, pp. 16-17, D C Sircar, JIH, XIV, pt I and the Successors of the Sātavāhanas, pp 321 ff, Weber, IA, 1875, p 244 Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde, Vol II, p 322 etc) Their theory is, however, contested by a set of other scholars (O Stein, Ind. Cult, 1, pp 343 ff, F. W. Thomas, Modi Comm Vol., pp 279 ff Sten Konow, JRAS, 1912, pp. 374 ff and others). It is difficult to be certain on this point The word Yavana seems to be an imitation of the Persian Yavana, itself formed from the name of Ionians but applied to Greeks in general.

3. Malavikā., Act V

with the river Indus[1] or the river Sindhu of Narwar in Central India.[2] In any case, if true, it shows that by the time of Vasumitra[3] the Yavanas, probably the Graeco-Bactrians who alone among the foreigners had entered into India by this time, had come upto the Indus or even Central India.

Pātañjali, the celebrated Sanskrit grammarian, citing instances of the use of a tense which indicates an action well-known to people but not actually witnessed by the speaker though it may well have been, says in his Mahābhāshya: "aruṇad Yavanaḥ Sāketam" (the Yavana besieged Sāketa); and "aruṇad Yavano Madhyamikāṁ" (the Yavana besieged Madhyamikā)[4]. It shows that a certain Yavana chief had beseiged not only Madhyamikā, that is, a place called Nagarī near Chitor,[5] but also Sāketa or Ayodhyā at the time when Pātañjali wrote the Mahābhāshya[6] or some time before it.[7] The Mahābhāshya can hardly be later than beginning of the Christian era.[8] By this time among the foreign invaders only the Graeco-Bactrians and the Śakas had

---

1. R. C. Mazumdar, IHQ. I, pp. 214-219; K. P. Jayaswal, JBORS, IV, pp. 257-265, R. P. Chanda, IHQ. V, pp. 393 ff and pp. 587 ff, P. C. Bagchi, IHQ. XII, pp. 81 ff; J. C. Powell Price, JUPHS, XIV, 1941, pp. 125-127; V. S. Upadhyaya, ibid., pp. 9-20 and others.

2. Cunn., N. C., 1870, pp. 226-7; Smith, EHI, 4, p. 209; Rapson, CHI, I, p. 520, and N. N. Ghosh, EHI, p. 159.

3. See the author's article in JGJRI, VII, p. 197 ff.

4. Mahābhā., III, 2, 111.

5. Kielhorn, Ind. Ant., VII, pp. 266 ff. The coins bearing the name Madhyamikā have been found at this place in an excavation. Madhyamikā has been mentioned with the Mālavas in the Mbh. (II, 32, 6) and with the Matsyas in the Bṛihatsaṁhitā (XIV, V. 2).

6. Goldstücker, Pāṇini, 1860, pp. 227 ff, and R. G. Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant., 1872, p. 300.

7. *Weber (Ind. Stud., XIII, pp. 312, 315, 319); H. C. Raychaudhuri* (PHAI, 6, p. 370) and de la Vallee Poussin (p. 200) have pointed out that the instances cited by Pātañjali may be stock illustrations (mūrdhābhishikta udāharaṇa) which have been quoted by him from earlier authorities.

8. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar (Ind. Ant., 1872, p. 300) drew our attention to the sentence in the Mahābhāshya (III, 2, 123), "iha Pushyamitram yājayāmah" ("here we perform the sacrifices for Pushyamitra") which is cited as an illustration of the vārttika teaching the use of the present tense to

come to India. The grammarian knows the Śakas as such. So by the Yavanas he is very likely to mean the Graeco-Bactrians.

Recently it has been noticed[1] that Abhayānandi commenting on Jainendra's Sutra II, 2,92 has referred to the Indian invasion of the Yavanas. Like Pātañjali, citing illustrations of the use of imperfect past tense, he says: "Aruṇad Mahendro Mathurām" and "Aruṇad Yavanaḥ Sāketam," that is, "Mahendra besieged Mathurā," and "the Yavana besieged Sāketa." It has been said that here there is a reference to the Yavana invasion of Sāketa and Mathurā. It is thought that Mahendra is really the emended form of Minendra, and that Minendra is Menander whose name in the Kharoshṭhī legends of his coins is found in this form.

The Gārgī-Samhitā section of the Yuga Purāṇa provides us with a little more information about the Yavana conquest of India.

Unfortunately, the different manuscripts of this work give different readings of the relevant passage which are almost in all cases hopelessly corrupt. It is not possible to find out

---

denote an action which has been begun but not finished. On this basis and on that *of other references to Pushyamitra in the Mahābhāshya (Pushya mitro yajate* III, 2,26 and Pushyamitra-sabhā I, 1, 69 etc.) made Pātañjali a contemporary of Pushyamitra in the second century *B. C.* For some time the historians accepted this date. But these sentences in the Mahābhāshya may be stock illustrations taken from the earlier grammarians. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar (Ind. Cult., I, 278) showed that Pātañjali has referred not only to the Yavanas but also to the Sakas who had not come to India upto the time of Pushyamitra. Since then many scholars (Dr. D. C Sircar, IHQ, 1941; Poussin, op cit., pp. 199 202 and Ind. Cult., II, p 584 and others) have attempted to show that Mahābhāshya contains much material of quite late date. They would place Pātañjali at the earliest somewhere in the early centuries *of the* Christian era. It is not impossible that Pātañjali lived earlier, and the *material pointed out by these scholars was interpolated later on in the* Mahābhāshya. Actually there is a tradition about redaction of the Mahābhāshya much after Pātañjali *(Goldstucker, op. cit.*, p. *237 ff*; P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Lectures on Pātañjali's Mahābhāshyam, p. XLIV ff and *others).* But in this case also the *fact* remains that on the basis of the Mahābhāshya the Yavana invasion cannot be placed with certainty much before the Christian era.

2. V. S. Agrawal, IHQ, XXIX, 1953, pp. 180 ff.

the definite meaning of the passage in full. However, it is clear that the Yavanas conquered Kusumadhwaja, *most* probably Pāṭaliputra.

The fact that the Yavanas had gone upto Magadha is proved beyond doubt by the unimpeachable evidence of a contemporary epigraphic record namely, the Hāthīgumphā inscription of king Khāravela. Describing the exploits of the king in the eighth year of his reign, the inscription says that Khāravela's advance beyond the Barābara Hills in the Gayā district of Bihar state caused fear to a Yavana king who was *somehow connected* with Mathurā.

The name of this Yavana king in the record is too badly mutilated to be restored beyond conjecture. But there *can be no doubt about the fact that about the beginning of* the Christian era, when Khāravela was ruling, the Yavanas had overrun the whole of the Gangetic basin.

We learn from the Nāsik cave inscription of Vāśishṭhīputra Pulumave that Gautamīputra Śatakarṇi destroyed the Śakas, the Yavanas and the Pahlavas (Śaka-Yavana-Pahalava-nishūdana).[1] Here the Yavanas, distinguished from the Śakas as well as the Pahlavas, are most probably the Graeco-Bactrians. As their destruction is mentioned with that of the Śakas and the Parthians, it seems that their principalities lasted in India upto the time of Gautamīputra Śatakarṇi. Certain inscriptions found in the caves at Nāsik, Junnar and Carle record gifts of some Hinduized Yavanas.[2]

7. THE GREEKS IN THE GANGETIC BASIN

The above discussion leaves little doubt that the Graeco-Bactrians advanced much in the Gangetic basin[3] and most

1. Dr. Sircar, op. cit., p. 197.

2. IO, I, pp. 243-357.

3. Whitehead thinks (N. C., 1940. pp. 3-4) that the Graeco-Bactrians penetrated into India only to the trans-Indus mountainous region but his arguments have been convincingly refuted by Marshall (Taxila, Vol. II, p. 33 fn. 4).

probably ruled over it for some time. Almost all historians think that these Graeco-Bactrians came under Demetrius or Menander. But in fact this view is open to criticism.[1]

The theory that Demetrius or Menander was the invader of the Gangetic basin came to be evolved gradually with the advancement of our knowledge of ancient Indian history on the basis of some data which are by this time definitely proved to be untenable. Thus some time ago Pātañjali was definitely thought to be a contemporary of Pushyamitra and his work, the Mahābhāshya, was thought to be written during the reign of this king. On this ground the Graeco-Bactrian invasions, of Chitor and Śaketa, alluded to in the Mahābhāshya, were taken to have happened in the reign of Pushyamitra. Now according to the not-so-certain Purāṇic chronology Pushyamitra ruled in the first half of the second century B. C. which is the time of Demetrius and Menander. So it was thought that only Demetrius or Menander could be the invader of theGangetic basin. Strabo has actually mentioned these Greek rulers as the greatest conquerors of India. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal gave still more support to this theory by reading the name of Demetrius in the Hāthīgumphā inscription as also in the Gārgī Samhitā.

Now, as shown above, in the light of later researches Pātañjali and his Mahābhāshya are not definitely known to be contemporaneous with Pushyamitra. They may be late. So the Graeco-Bactrian invasion referred to by them cannot be taken with perfect certainty to have occurred in the time of Pushyamitra. The idea about the name of Demetrius in the Hāthīgumphā as also in the Gārgi Samhitā is found to be quite baseless. Strabo, no doubt, mentions Demetrius and Menander as the greatest Greek conquerors of India at one time. But he gives the utmost limit of the penetration

1. See the author's article "The Yavana Invader of Magadha" in JBORI, Vol. XXXVII.

of these conquerors into India only upto Surāshṭra and Kāthiāwaṛ in the south and the river Yamunā in the east. From his account it is quite clear that neither Demetrius nor Menander penetrated into India as far as Sāketa and Pāṭliputra. He is hardly ready to accept Menander's advance even upto the Yamunā beyond the Beās.

Even if it be accepted for the sake of argument that Demetrius or Menander occupied the inner Gangetic basin, their rule in this region becomes inexplicable on account of total want of any archaeological evidence of their rule in this area. Even their coins, found so abundantly in the north-west, are conspicuous by their complete absence in the mid-Gangetic basin. To avoid this difficulty it is said that Demetrius or Menander remained in occupation of this part of the country only for a short time and they had to leave it for ever to fight against Eucratides. For the evidence of this fact we are referred to a vague statement in the Gārgī Samhitā where it is alleged to have been said that "the Greeks will not stay in the Madhyadeśa" (Madhyadeśe na *sthāshyanti Yavanā yuddhadurmadāḥ*). This reading is, however, by no means certain. One manuscript of the Gārgī Samhitā actually gives quite an opposite meaning viz., "the Greeks will stay in the Madhyadeśa" (Madhyadeśe cha sthāshyanti Yavanā yuddhadurmadāh).[1] The whole text may be taken to support the existence of the Greek rule in the Gangetic basin for a long time. The other Purāṇas also, which generally describe the kings of the Gangetic basin, speak of eight Yavana rulers.[2] The unquestionable contemporary epigraphic testimony of the Hāthīgumphā and Nāsik cave records too proves that the Greek rule continued in

---

1. Expulsion of the Graeco-Bactrians from Madhyadeśa is generally taken to mean their withdrawal from Sāketa and Pātaliputra. In the Buddhist literature Madhyadeśa no doubt includes the area in which these cities are situated. But according to the Purāṇas, the *Gārgī Samhitā* also is a part of a Purānic work, Madhyadeśa was too much towards the west to include these cities.

2. Pargiter, *PTDKA*, pp. 44 ff.

the inner Gangetic basin as late as the beginning of the Christian era. It appears to us that the Greeks came to the mid-Gangetic basin much after Demetrius and Menander under the pressure of the Śakas and the Pahlavas in the first century B. C.

It is strange that the Indo-Greeks who ruled over the whole of the Gangetic basin have left no memorials of their rule in this region—not even their coins which are so abundant wherever they founded their kingdoms. If it be so, as it is, we shall have to reject the Greek occupation of northern India which appears to us, however, as certain as any other fact of ancient Indian history. Under these hard circumstances we venture to conjecture that some of the so-called Mitra[1] and other kings, who ruled over the Gangetic basin at this time, are Greeks with Hinduized names. Unlike the earlier and contemporary Indian kings, they issued a large number of coins, like the Indo-Greeks of their time, with kingly legends, found especially at the places enumerated as the main targets of Yavana conquest in ancient Indian literature. These kings are completely ignored in ancient Indian literature. At the time when the Hāthīgumphā inscription refers to a Yavana king in North India, only these kings were ruling all over it. Their coins and inscriptions are found from Mathurā to Bihar which is suggested to be the sphere of the activity of the Yavana king. It is true that

Hellenism is not much visible even in the culture of the Indo-Greek kings of the North-West. It appears in this country only with the advent of the Parthians, the Śakas and the Kushāṇas and then also in Indian garb.

---

kings with the rulers of Suṅga dynasty. This view has, however, been strongly refuted by a number of scholars (Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, p. 79; Allan, op. cit., p. cxx; A. S. Altekar, JNSI, IV, pp. 138 ff; H. K. Prasad, JNSI, XVII, 1955, pp. 24 ff; Barua, IHQ, 1930, pp. 1 ff and others). Now it is generally believed that these kings have no identity with any of the known Indian rulers. The Mitra kings were followed by similar rulers whose names ended in —datta, —bhuti, and —ghosha. To us these rulers appear to be Hinduized Yavana, Śaka or Pahlava kings.

CHAPTER VI

THE INDO-PARTHIANS

In their rule all over the Indo-Kābul basin, the Greeks were followed by another people coming from the West. The Classical historians refer to them as Parthians probably because originally they were local chiefs in the eastern-most provinces of the Parthian empire. For a clear understanding of their history, it is necessary to have some idea of this empire.

1. THE PARTHIAN EMPIRE

Situated just to the south-east of the Caspian Sea on the western side of Bactria, Parthia was a border province of the Seleucid empire. In the middle of the third century B. C. its Greek governor declared his independence like that of Bactria. As noted above in connection with the Indo-Greeks, the Classical writers, Justin and Strabo, have described both these revolutions together. Soon afterwards, however, the new Greek king of Parthia, unlike that of Bactria, was overthrown by some people coming from the eastern side. With the empire founded by them later on, these people came to be known as Parthians.

"Such information as we possess about the origin of the Parthians indicates that they belonged to the Parni tribe. This formed part of the Dahae, a great group of Scythian tribes who led a nomadic life in the steppe country between the Caspian Sea and the Sea of Aral. They were horsemen and warriors for whom, according to the ancient writers, to die fighting was the supreme happiness, and death from natural causes ignominious and shameful. It is thought that about 250 B. C. two brothers, Arsaces and Tiridates, with their forces under the command of five other chiefs, occupied the district of the Upper Tegis,

Diodotus, the new ruler of Bactria, attacked these nomads, but they fled from him and invaded the neighbouring province of Parthia, where they slew the local satrap. Two years later Arsaces fell in battle, but under Tiridates the Parthians occupied the district that today forms the ttrans-Caspian frontier between Russia and Iran."

About 235 B C. Seleucus II, the Seleucid emperor, attempted to contain this movement and throw back the invaders. But the outbreak of a serious trouble at his capital compelled him to abandon his operations and to return in haste to Syria. The Parthians were quick to take advantage of his withdrawal. Tiridates re-occupied the district he had conquered earlier and shortly afterwards annexed Hyrcania, the province on the south-eastern shore of the Capian Sea which formed the core of the Parthian empire.

Towards the close of the third century B. C. Antiochus III the Great went on his famous eastern campaign. Between 212 and 210 B. C. he defeated Artabanus I, the successor of Tiridates, and forced him to accept Seleucid overlordship. But Artabanus' successor, Phriapatius, took advantage of the defeat inflicted on Antiochus III by the Romans and reconquered the provinces south of the Caspian Sea.

The real founder of the Parthian empire was Mithradates I (C. 171-130 B. C.) who was a contemporary of Eucratides. Between the years 161 and 140 he forcibly annexed Media, Elymais, Persis, Characere, Babylonia, and Assyria which had become independent of Seleucid control disorganised by the Roman attacks. In the east he conquered Gedrosia and also seized Herat and Seistan. According to Strabo[1] the Parthians "grew so powerful, continually encroaching upon the neighbouring territory by reason of their successes in war, that finally they established

1. Strabo, Geography, XI, 9, 2 3. Cf. Konow, Corpus, pp. XXIX-XXX.

themselves as masters of all within Euphrates. They further appropriated a portion of Bactria by bringing force to bear upon the Scythians and even before that upon those about Eucratides."

The Roman historian Oresius states that Mithradates I conquered all the peoples between the *Hydaspes* and the Indus. Here the Indus is, no doubt, the river Sindhu but Hydaspes has been identified either with Beās in the Punjab[1] or the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil in Persia.[2] In any case Mithradates' empire bordered on the Indus.

The successors of Mithradates do not appear to have been so powerful. Phraates II (138-128 B. C.) had to call in Scythian auxiliaries in his wars against Syria and when he tried to withhold their wages, they turned against him and he was killed in battle.[3]

The next king Artabanus II (128-123 B. C.) was no more successful. The Scythians are stated to have returned to their own country after having devastated Parthia, content with their victory; but Artabanus afterwards died of wounds received in a battle against the Tochari.[4]

The fortunes of Parthia were, however, restored by Artabanus' son and successor, Mithradates II, the Great (123-88 B. C.), who not only "fought several times successfully the Scythians and was the avenger of the injury of his parents," but also "added many peoples to the Parthian kingdom."[5] It was during his reign that the struggle between the kings of Parthia and their Scythian subjects in eastern

1. Smith, Cat. Coins Ind. Mus., Calcutta, I, p. 35 and EHI, 3, p. 229; H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 6, p. 426 fn. 1; Franz Altheim, Weltgeschichte Asien's imgriechischen Zeitalter, Vol. II, p. 63.

2. Rapson, CHI, I, p. 568; Konow, Corpus, p. xxx; Tarn, GBI, 2, p. 524.

3. Justin, XLII, 1, 2 ff.

4. Justin, XLII, 1, 2 ff.

5. Ibid.

Iran was brought to a close and the suzerainty of Parthia over the ruling powers of Seistan and Kandahar confirmed. There are some coins on which the title 'King of Kings' appears on the obverse with legend in Greek, the official language of the Parthian empire, and on the reverse the name of his viceroy with the legend in Kharoshṭhī prevailing in Kandahar.

We do not know much about the history of Parthia after Mithradates II. About the king Sinatruces who seems to have been ruling between 77 and 70 B. C., we learn from Lucian that he had been staying with Sacaraucae before he was summoned back to Parthia. His son Phraates III (70-57 B C.) was able to some extent to retrieve the fortunes of Parthia, and his sons, Mithradates III (57 B. C.) and Orodes I (57-37 B. C.), and his grandson Phraates IV (37-2 B. C.), the Parthian empire held its own against the Romans. From the time of Phraates follows a time of internal war and bloodshed covering several kings ruling for a few years each until, expelling Vonones I (A. D. 8-12), Artabanus III (12-40 A. D.) occupied the throne.

It appears that all through this troublesome period the eastern boundary of the Parthian empire as settled by Mithradates the Great remained intact, if it actually did not increase. Isidor of Charax, generally placed towards the close of the first century B. C.,[1] enumerates the following provinces in the eastern part of this empire: "(1) Aria, with its capital, Alexandria-among-the Arians, the modern Herāt; (2) the country of the Anauoi, being a segment of Aria, with its chief town Phra, the modern Farrah; (3) Zarangiana or Drangiana, lying further south, E. long. 60°, N. Lat. 31-32°, to the east of the Hamun or Zareh lake; (4) Sakastana, to the south-east of the last, including Sigal,

1. Schoff, the Parthian Stations of Isidor of Charax, 17. Cf. Tarn, GBI, p. 53.

the Śaka capital, a province to the north of the Helmund river; and lastly (5) Arachosia, which the Parthians called White India, with its capital Alexandropolis, the modern Kandahār."[1]

2. THE INDO-PARTHIANS KNOWN FROM LITERATURE

There is little evidence that the Parthian emperors ever ruled over large parts of India or the Indo-Kābul valley. But some western and Chinese historians assert that the Parthians did so. Obviously these Parthians are different from the Parthian emperors. We may designate them as Indo-Parthians.

Justin[2] informs us: "The Bactrians having been harassed by various wars lost not only their dominions but also their liberty. As if worn out by the wars of Sogdians and the Arachosians and the Drangians and the Arians and the Indians, they were finally finished by the Parthians although they were weaker."

Here the Bactrians[3] are, no doubt, the Indo-Greek kings of the Indo-Kābul basin. According to Justin they were succeeded by the Parthians.

The Chinese historian Fan-Ye refers to the Parthian occupation of the Kābul valley: "Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien-tchou (India), Kipin (somewhere in

1. Smith, ZDMG, 60, 1906, pp. 57 ff; Cf. Sten Konow, Corpus, XXXVIII.

2. XL, I, 6.

3. Strabo tells of the Greek kings of Bactria being ousted by some nomadic tribes such as Asioi, Pasianoi, Tocharioi and Sacarauloi (xi, 8, 2). Trogus and Chinese historians also corroborate him. But it is noteworthy that while Justin speaks of "the Bactrians", Strabo speaks of "Bactria". It seems that the Greek kings of Bactria were finally (Strabo, xi, 9, 2 mentions conquest of a part of Bactria even by the Parthians, 'from the Scythians and earlier from those about the Eucratides') conquered by the northern nomads, while the Graeco-Bactrian kings of the Indo-Kābul region by the Indo-Parthians.

the Indo-Kābul Region) or Nagansi (Parthia), became powerful it brought *Kao-fu* (the Kābul valley) into subjection. When it grew weak, it lost Kao-fu. Later Kao-fu fell under the rule of Parthia."[1]

The same historian throws still more light on this point in the same work: "Kao-fu was never dependent on the Yeuh-chi, and it is, therefore, a mistake of the Han Book (i. e. the Chien Han-Shu) when it includes it among the five hi-hous. Later on it fell under the dependancy of An-shi (Parthia), and it was when the Yueh-chi triumphed over Anshi (Parthia) that they, for the first time, took Kao-fu." It is clear from this passage that the Kābul valley came in the hands of the Parthians, whose coins are found in this region, just before the same was possessed by the Kushāṇas from the Parthians.

In 43-44 A. D. Appollonius of Tyana visited Takshaśilā and he found its throne occupied by king Phraates, evidently a Parthian.[2] According to the itinerary of Apollonius this king was independent of the Parthian emperor and himself strong enough to exercise the suzerain power over the satraps of the Indus valley. He had enlisted the services of certain barbarians to patrol his country so that instead of invading his dominions they themselves kept off the 'barbarians' that were on the other side of the frontier and were difficult people to deal with.

Also the author of the Periplus of the Erythraean sea, who lived about 60 A. D.,[3] refers to the Parthian rule in the Indus valley. His narrative tells us that "beyond this region (the bay of Gedrosia), the continent making a wide curve from the east across the depths of the bays, there follows the

1. The Hou Han-Shu, Chapt. 118. Cf. Konow, Corpus, II, 1, p. XXV. See also JRAS, 1912 p. 676 and Journ Dept Letters, Calcutta Univ., I, 81.

2. The Life of Apollonius, ed. Conybeare, I, pp. 153 ff.

3. The Periplus, Schoff, Introd., pp. 7-15

coast district of Scythia, which lies above towards the north, the whole marshy, from which flows down the river Sinthus ......This river has seven mouths, very shallow and marshy, so that they are not navigable, except the one in the middle, at which by the shore, is the market town Barbaricum. Before it there lies a small island, and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagar, it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."[1]

All this shows clearly that the Indo-Greeks were succeeded by the Parthians, who ruled over the whole of the Indo-Kābul basin about the middle of the first century A. D. According to Apollonius these Parthians were different from and independent of the Parthian emperors. The Periplus also refers to them as if there were many of them ruling separately over small kingdoms.

3. THE INDO-PARTHIANS KNOWN FROM COINS

A large number of coins found from several places scattered all over Seistan, Arachosia, Arla and the Indo-Kābul basin confirm the information coming from literature. They show that many chiefs, bearing Parthian names and imitating Parthian coins, occupied the whole of the Indo-Kābul basin just after the Indo-Greeks. These chiefs came from Seistan and Arachosia which once formed the provinces of the Parthian empire. The earliest of them, probably starting as Parthian governors, became independent rulers and extended their hold towards India at the cost of the Indo-Greeks.[2] They might have been pressed into India by the Scythian invasions of their homeland. These kings are

1. Ibid., Paras 87-88.

2. Dr. A. K. Narain with some other scholars is inclined to believe that originally these kings were Scythians (the barbarians of Chinese Turkistan who were different from the Sakas living still more eastward) who had settled in the Gazani Kandahar region during the reign of Phraates II and Artabanus II from C. 139 to 124 B. C. (The Indo-Greeks, pp. 140 ff). But

known as Pahlavas or Pārthavas in Indian literature and epigraphy probably after the name of the county from which they came.[1]

MAUES

Maues is perhaps the earliest Parthian king of India.[2] He is known mostly from his coins found usually in the Swāt valley and Gandhāra. On these coins his name is given as Moa in Kharoshṭhī and as Maues in Greek. For their excellent execution and closeness to the issues of certain Indo-Greek kings, they are generally assigned an early date in the second quarter of the first century B. C.[3]

Maues has been identified with mahārāja Moya of the Taxila Copper Plate inscription dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era.[4] At Maira in the Salt Range a Kharoshṭhī inscription is said to be dated in the year 58 of a king named Moa.[5] Damijada of the Shahdaur inscription, probably dated in the year 60, is sometimes thought to be a sub-king of Maues as his name in its abbreviated form Dami is said to

from Isidor of Charax we learn that all the countries on the western side of the Indus, from which the Indo-Parthians came, were included in the Parthian empire upto the beginning of the Christian era, that is, the time of the Indo-Parthians.

1. According to E. Herzfeld the Seistan-Arachosia area was also known as Pārthava or Pahlava in olden times (MASI, 34, p. 6).

2. It is difficult to determine with certainty whether Maues was a Parthian or a Saka king. But on the basis of affinity of his titles and coins with the issues and titles of some Arsacid and Indo-Parthian kings he is thought to be a Parthian (V. Smith, ZDMG, 1906 p. 53; R. B. Whitehead, Cat. Coins Punj. Mus., I p. 92 and NC, 1940, pp. 89 122; Lohuizen, S. P., pp. 336-340; A. S. Altekar, JNSI, 1947, pp. 11 ff. and others). His earliest coins imitate the issues of Demetrius Apollodotus and Mithradates I which he could get in Seistan and Arachosia. He might have started his career from the last named Parthian satrapies.

3. Gardner, BMCC, Greek and Scythic Kings, p. XL; Rapson, CHI, pp. 590 ff; Lohuizen, S. P., p. 34, Marshall, Taxila, II, p. 34 and others.

4. Fleet alone does not accept this identification (JRAS, 1907, p. 1024; 1913, p. 1007 and 1914, p. 997). For a criticism of this view see JRAS, 1932, pp. 88-89.

5. Cunningham gave this opinion but now the inscription is not legible Cf. Lohuizen, p. 312.

appear on some coins of Maues.[1] Mansehra and Fatehjang have yielded similar inscriptions probably dated in the year 68. All these inscriptions[2] are generally referred to an era starting from about 150 B.C. Attributed to Maues they will give for his reign approximately 90-70 B. C.

VONONES

At the time Maues was ruling in Gandhāra, Vonones, who bears a distinctly Parthian name, was occupying the throne of Aria, Arachosia and Seistan.

We learn from Cunningham[3] that the coins of Vonones and his family came chiefly from the ancient Arachosia or Kandahar and Ghazni. Some of them have also been found in Seistan, the ancient Drangiana. A few have been obtained at Kābul, but as not a single specimen was got at Begram by Masson during his three years' collection, it seems almost certain that Vonones could not have ruled there. For a similar reason the family of Vonones could not have ruled for any time in the Punjab, as their coins are very rarely found there."[4]

The coins of Vonones[5] have on the obverse the Greek legend "*Basileos Basileon* Meglou Vononoy," and on the reverse in Kharoshṭhī letters, either "maharajabhrata dhramikasa palahorasa" or "śpalahora-putras dramiasa spalagadamasa." It shows that during his reign Vonones was helped in his administration by two sub-kings :

---

1. A. K. Narain, The Indo-Greeks, p. 143.
2. Konow, C. I. I., pp. 11, 13, 18 22.
3. Cunn., N. C., 3rd Series, X, 1890, p. 106.
4. John Marshall makes Vonones to rule over Takshaśilā on the basis of discovery of some *coins of Spalahores* and Spalagadama there (*Taxila*, II, p. 51) Since the time of Cunningham Azes coins have been noticed in the Kābul valley as well as in the excavations at Takshaśilā (A. K Narain, The Indo-Greeks, p. 103). As shown above Fan-Ye also says that the Kābul valley was conquered by the Parthians from the Greeks before it came under the Kushāṇas.
5. For the coins of this and the following chapters see Cunningham, Num Chron., *3rd series*, 1890; P. Gardner, *Brit. Mus. Cat. of the Coins of the*

(1) Śpalahora who is called mahārāja-bhrātā (the king's brother); and

(2) Śpalagadama, son of Śpalahora.

The two classes of coins which bear the name of Vonones are distinguished respectively by the type of Demetrius' 'Heracles standing', and the type of Heliocles' 'Zeus standing.' They were issued presumably in the districts nearabout Seistan, Aria and Arochosia which were once under the sway of these Yavana kings.

Śpalyris

Then again we have some coins which give "Śpalyrios dikaiou adelphoy tou basileos" on the obverse in Greek, and "spalahoraputras dhramiasa śpalagadamas" on the reverse in Kharoshṭhī. Here Śpalyris, who is called brother of the king like Śpalahora, appears without any sovereign title with Śpalagadama as his sub-king. This Śpalyris has been identified with Śpalahora on the ground that Śpalyris is the Greek form of Kharoshṭhī Śpalahora, and it has been suggested that he issued these coins under the sovereignty of Vonones.

Śpalirises

In this group we have the coins of one more king named Śpalirises whose coins may be arranged in three categories :

1. *Śpalarises without honorifics.* Obv. *(Greek) basileos* adelphoy śpalirisoy. Rev. (Kharosṭhī) maharaja-bhrata *dhramiasa śpalirisasa.*

2. Spalirises with honorifics. Obv. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou spalirisoy. Rev. (Kh) maharajasa.

Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India; R. B. Whitehead, *Cat. Coins* Punjab Mus., Lahore, Vol. I, V. A. Smith, ZDMG, 1906 and Cat. Coins Ind. Mus., Calcutta, I; Rapson, CHI, I and the Indian Coins; Marshall Reports of Taxila excavations in ASI, AR, since 1910 and Taxila, Vol. II, and others.

3. Śpalirises with Azes. Obv. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou śpalirisoy. Rev. (Kh.) maharajasa mahatakasa ayasa.

The first category is supposed to have been issued when Śpalirises was merely a sub-king under the sovereign whom he calls his brother.[1] The second category was obviously struck when Śpalirises became the suppreme ruler. The third category *shows that he had* Azes(I)[2] *as his sub-king who also*, however, bears sovereign titles. It seems that Śpalirises was a sub-king of Vonones whom he succeeded after his death. Most probably Vonones was an old man at the time of coming on the throne for he did not strike any coin on which he alone was mentioned. His brothers also could not have been young, because Śpalagadama, the son of his brother Śpalyris, was old enough to occupy a place in the reverse inscriptions of some of the coins of Vonones. The coins of Śpalirises as king in his own right are very rare. It suggests that he did not survive Vonones for more than a few years.

The reverse type of the coins issued by Śpalirises as the successor of Vonones in eastern Iran is 'Zeus enthroned' which is evidently borrowed from the coins of Hermaues. It has sometimes been interpreted as an indication that the kingdom of the Kābul valley had now passed from the Yavanas to the Pahlavas of Kandahar.[3] But from similarity of types alone we can be hardly sure about this fact. The coins of Śpalirises found in the Kābul valley number only two or three.

1. Generally this sovereign has been identified with Vonones. But Herzfeld identifies him with Maues (Camb. Short. Hist., p. 69).

2. Prof. Rapson thinks that the associate of Spalirises was Azes II (CHI, I, 573; see also Bachofer, JAOS, I, 49). Some other scholars have shown that he should be Azes I (N. G. Majumdar, ASI, AR, 1928-29, p. 178; Marshall, JRAS, 1947, pp. 13-19; Tarn, GBI, p. 320 ff and *others*).

3. B. M. Cat., p. 101, note; and CHI, I, 1965, p. 518.

4. While Rapson (CHI, I, pp. 561-2) and Tarn (GBI, pp. 347, 350), think that the Kābul valley was conquered by Spalirises, Marshall (Taxila, I, p. 52) and A. K. Narain (The Indo-Greeks, pp. 153 ff.) are of the opinion that it was annexed by Azes I.

AZES

Azes is associated on the coins with some other kings. In the order of chronology, as known through the stratigraphy of these coins in the excavations at Takshaśilā, we may arrange these coins in the following way[1] :

1. AZES ALONE

Obv. (Greek) basileos basileon meglou ajoy.
Rev. (Kharoshṭhī) maharajasa mahatasa dhramikasa, or rajatirajasa ayasa, or maharajasa rajarajasa ayasa etc.

2. AZES AND AZILISES

Obv. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou ajoy.
Rev. (Kh.) maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa ayilishasa.

3. AZILISES ALONE

Ov. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou ajilisoy.
Rev. (Kh.) maharajas rajatirajasa or rajarajas mahatasa ayilishasa.

4. AZILISES AND AZES

Obv. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou ajilisoy.
Rev. (Kh.) maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa ayasa.

5. AZES AND ASPAVARMAN

Obv. (Gr.) basileos basileon meglou ajoy.
Rev. (Kh.) indravarmaputrasa aspavarmas strategas jayatasa.

While the coins of Vonones and his associates are found mostly in Kandahar and Seistan and only rarely in the Kābul valley and the Punjab, those of Azes and his associates are

1. Marshall, JRAS, 1914, p. 979.

limited only to the Punjab, the Kābul valley and Gazani region.[1] It seems that in the time of Azes his family lost its original dominions in Kandahar-Seistan, and that it settled in the Indo-Kābul valley at the cost of Hermaues and Hippostratus, respectively the last Greek rulers of the Kābul valley and Gandhāra.

AZES I

We may attribute all the earliest coins of Azes, likely to be issued by a single ruler, to Azes I.[2]

This king has copied the 'Athena Alkis' type coins of Menander's line issued by Apollodotus and Hippostratus.[3] He has also restruck some coins of the latter kings and has continued the use of some of their most distinctive monograms.[4] It shows that Azes not only succeeded to some parts of Maues' dominions, whose coins also he copies, most probably just to the east and west of the Indus in Gandhāra, where Mauses' coins are commonly found, but that he seized some parts of the eastern Punjab from the Graeco-Bactrian kings. G. K. Jenkins is, however, of the opinion that Appollodotus, Hilopostratus, Azes I and Maues issued their coins from the same mint at Takshaśilā, and places the Graeco-Bac-

1. Cunningham, Coins of the Sakas, pp. 106-7 ; G. K. Jenkins, JNSI, XVII, 1955, pp. 1 ff ; and A. K. Narain, The Indo-Greeks, pp. 163-4.

2. Marshall (Taxila, 1951) accepts in essence, with one or two minor modifications, the division arrived at by Vincent Smith (IMC, Vol. I) in regard to the coins of Azes I and those of Azes II—the only one of the main Azes' issues assigned to Azes II being the base silver of the Zeus Nikephoros type. But *according to* G. K. Jenkins (JNSI, XVII, 1955, pp. 1 ff.) all the Azes' issues with the 'King Mounted Holding Spear' obverse should be attributed to Azes I while those with the 'King Mounted Holding Whip' obverse to Azes II.

3. CHI, I, 1955, p. 500.

4. Whitehead, Lahore Mus. Cat., p. 122 note ; B. M. Cat., pp. 69-73 ; E. J. Rapson, CHI, 1955, p. 516 ; G. K. *Jenkins, JNSI, XVII, 1955, p. 15* and others.

AZILISES

trian kings between Maues and Azes in the rule of this place.[1] On the testimony of coins Marshall has put the dominions of this king upto the Kābul valley.[2]

King Azes I struck some coins bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of Azilises in Kharoshṭhī on the reverse. It shows that for some time Azilises was a sub-king under Azes.[3] Then we have the coins having legends of Azilises on the obverse as well as on the reverse. Azilises must have issued these coins during his own reign. Some coins with the obverse Greek legend Azilises and the reverse Kharoshṭhī legend Azes show that in the last stage of his kingship Azilises had a sub-king, Azes (II).[4] Compared to those of Azes I and II, the coins of Azilises are found in a far less number and variety probably showing shortage of his reign.

AZES II

Azilises was succeeded by Azes II. There are two inscriptions[5] associated with the name of Aya or Azes, the Kala-

wan inscription and the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription, dated respectively 134 and 136. *According to some* scholars[1] Aya is the name of the reigning king in these epigraphs. This view is, however, not *certain* and it is very probable that Azes II was already dead at the time of these records.[2]

GONDOPHERNES

Like Vonones, Gondophernes also is decidedly a Parthian name. Almost everyone accepts him to be a Parthian.[3]

The stratum which yielded the coins of Azes II at Takshaśilā contained at upper levels also the coins of Gondophernes and his successors. It shows that Azes II was succeeded by Gondophernes. This fact is indicated even by the coins bearing the name of Aspavarman. On the obverse of some of these coins we find the name of Azes and on the reverse that of Aspavarman. Similarly on the obverse of some other coins we find the coin type and symbols of Gondophernes and on their reverse the name of Aspavarman. Aspavarman seems to have worked under both Azes and Gondophernes. Within one generation Takshaśilā, passed from Azes (II) to Gondophernes.

---

1. R. Ghirshman, Begram, 1945, p. 105 ; D. C. Sircar, Age Imp. Unity, p. 131 and others.

2. The absence of any honorific title before the name in these records has made some historians doubtful about it being the king's name (A. Banerji-Shastri, JBORS, 1937, pp. 261-68 ; and Lohuizen, S. P., p. 13) or at least that of the reigning sovereign (Marshall, *JRAS, 1914,* p. *976 ff;* Konow, JRAS, 1932, p. 953 and Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 6, p. 454). The coin-hoards of Mohmand and Chaman (JNSI, XVII, 1955, p. 23 ff.) contain numerous coins of Vonones and Azes kings. But they do not have a single coin of Gondophernes or any Kushāṇa king. It shows that Azes II came before the Kushāṇas as well as Gondophernes.

3. E. Herzfeld thinks that Gondophernes was a member of the Suren family which established its rule in Seistan under Orthognes at the cost of the Atropatene dynasty of Parthia (Iran in the Ancient East, pp 291-92). See also Marshall (Taxila, II, pp. 58-59). Rostovtzeff, on the other hand, thinks that Gondophernes was a Parthian *chief* and at *least* in the beginning of his career was supported by Artabanus III (Chap. XI, p. 112, n. 1). Apparently there is little evidence for any of these views.

The Takht-i-Bahi inscription is dated in the year 103 of Guduvhara, Gondophernes. The mention of the year 26 in the record is said to refer to the 26th regnal year of the king. It means that Gondophernes came to throne about (103-58-26) = 19 A. D., if his date be referred to the so-called Vikrama era as it is generally done.

It has long been recognised that Gondophernes is identical with a 'King of India,' called Gudnaphar, who plays a role in a Christian tradition[1] associated with St. Thomas, the apostle of Indian Parthia. This tradition, starting from the 3rd century A. D., places Gondophernes in the beginning of the Christian era. It also refers to the king's brother Gad, sometimes identified with Guda or Gudana associated with Gondophernes on some coins. We find a still more distant echo of his name in one more Christian tale according to which Gaspar (Gathaspar in Armenian), the Indian, came from the East to worship Christ at his nativity. He has also been identified by some scholars with king Phraates of Takshaśilā mentioned in the life of Apollonius of Tyana.

The coins of Gondophernes are found not only in the Punjab but also in Sind, Kandahar, Seistan and the Kābul valley.[2] He appears to have succeeded to the whole dominions of the family of Vonones including Azes whose coin-types he has copied. Some copper issues of this king, imitated from certain coins of some Parthian emperors, were probably intended for currency in Seistan.[3]

The coins of Gondophernes are not only found over a large area but they also come out in large numbers and in

1. See inter alia Sylvain Levi, JA, 1897, pp. 27 ff. and IA, XXXIII, 1904, pp. 10 ff. W. R. Philips, IA, XXXII, 1903, pp. 1 ff, 145 ff. Fleet, JRAS, 1905, pp. 223 ff; Rapson, CHI, I, pp. 578 ff. H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 6, p. 452; Sten Konow, Corpus, II, i, pp. 77 ff. Lohuizen, S P, pp. 303-5 and others.

2. Cunn., RASI II, p. 59

3. Marshall, Taxila, II, p. 152.

several varieties. In their Greek legends, besides the conventional Greek formula, 'basileos basileon megalou', Gondophernes also bears the titles of 'soter' and 'autokrator'. Similarly in the Kharoshṭhī legends in addition to traditional Kharoshṭhī honorifics, 'maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa dhamiasa,' he calls himself also 'tratarasa', 'devavrata' and 'apratihata'. There is a class of coins which has been sometimes interpreted to give him some more titles. They have on the obverse the Greek legend, 'basileon megas orthagnes' and on the reverse Kharoshṭhī, 'maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa guduvharasa gudana (or guda, or gada, or gudanasa).'[1]

Orthagnes on these coins is said either to be the name of the overlord of Gondophernes in Seistan and Kandahar where these coins are found, or that of his predecessor brother, or the title or surname of Gondophernes himself. Similarly Gada has been said to be either the name of Gondophernes himself or that of his brother or tribe.[2]

SASA

Certain coins throw some light on the successors of Gondophernes. On the reverse of a group of coins, whose obverse Greek legend is corrupt, we find in Kharoshṭhī, 'maharajasa rajatirajasa (or mahatasa) devavradasa guduharasasasa.' That Sasa here is the name of a king is made certain by a coin described by V. A. Smith which has the reverse legend as '(rayara)yasa apratihatachakasa devavradasa sasasa'. Sir John Marshall also found some Sasa coins at Sirkap.[3] On the obverse they bear a bust (of Pacores ?) and on the reverse the legend, 'maharajasa aspabhataputrasa

1. For these coins and their various interpretations see Cunn., N. C., 3rd series, X, p. 121 ff, Gardner, BMC, p. XLV and 103; Rapson, CHI, p. 576; Whitehead, Punjab Mus. Cat., pp. 155 ff; Konow, Corpus, II, i, p. XLV ff. and others.

2. For these views see E. Herzfeld, Sakastan, p. 103; Rapson, CHI, I, p. 577; Lohuizen, S. P., pp. 358 ff and others.

3. ASI, AR, 1912-13, pp. 44, 49 ff.

tratarasa sasasa', that is, 'of the mahārāja, the brother's *son of Aspa (varma), the saviour.'*

ABDAGASES

*Some other coins found in the western Punjab men*tion a nephew of Guduvhara called Abdagases. There are two different legends on these coins namely, 'basileos soteros abdagasoy' on the obverse in Greek, and 'maharayasa avadagasasa tradarasa' on the reverse, and 'basileos basileon abdagasoy' on the obverse and 'guduvharabhradaputra-maharaja (tradarasa) avadagasasa' on the reverse. Whitehead has registered a coin with the legend, 'maharajasa rajatirajasa gadavharabrataputrasa avadagasasa.'[1] These coins are in all respects of metal, type and style similar to the billon coins of Gondophernes perhaps showing that Abdagases was a subking of Gondophernes. However, later on he appears to have followed Gondophernes as an independent king in Seistan where he issued a copper coinage similar to that of his predecessor.[2] Some scholars identify this king with Abdagases mentioned by Tacitus in connection with some events of the year 35 A. D.[3] when he might be working as a subking.

PACORES

Some coins picked up near about Kandahar have much similarity with those of Gondophernes and bear the name of Pacores with the sovereign titles of 'basileos basileon' and 'maharajasa rajatirajasa mahatasa'. Pacores was probably suzerain in eastern Iran some time after Gondophernes.

---

1. Punj. Mus. Cat., p. 154. But Konow has some doubt about the reading (Corpus, II, i, p. XLVII).

2. BMC, p. 107 nos 1-4 and Pl. XXIII, no. 1; PMC, pp 153-154 and Pl. XV *no. 70. Cf.* Marshall, Taxila, II, p. 61.

3. Cunningham, N. C., 1890, p. 119 and Lohuizen, S. P., pp. 357 ff.

SANABARES

Some coins of Gondophernes' type bearing the Greek legend 'basileos megas sanabares' have been found in Seistan only with the Greek and Pahlavi legend.

SAPEDANES AND SATAVASTRA

At Sirkap Sir John Marshall had found a jar[1] containing one coin each of Pacores and Kadphises I or II. There were some more coins in the jar with the portrait and symbols of Gondophernes. The Greek legend on them is only partially legible but the Kharoshṭhī legend reads, '*maharajasa rajarajasa tratarasa dhramiasa sapedanasa*', and '*maharajasa rajarajasa tratarasa satavastrasa*'.

It seems that after the death of the great Parthian monarch Gondophernes his empire split up into several small principalities propably under the pressure of the Kushāṇas. One of these (probably Seistan) was ruled over by Abdagases and Sanabares, another (probably Kandahar) by Pacores, the third (probably Sind) by Sapedanes, and the fourth (probably the Kābul valley) by Sasa and Satavastra. It appears that not very long after his death the Indo-Kābul valley passed under the Kushāṇas. No copper coins of the successors of Gondophernes are found in this region and all the known silver pieces of the three of them were found together in only one jar on the stratum which yeilded many copper coins of Hermaues and Kujul Kadhhises.[2] The Silver Vase inscription[3] of Jihonika (identified with Zeionises of the coins), the Kshatrapa of Chukhsa near Takshaśilā, which is dated in the year 191 (135 A. D. ?), bears the symbol of Kujul Kar, not of Gondophernes. His father Manigula is called brother of the Mahārāja (maharajabhrata) on Jiho-

1. ASI, AR, 1913 14, pp. 44-80; see also ibid., 1929 30, pp 55-56.
2. Marshall, JRAS, 1914, p. 990.
3. JRAS, 1925, p. 187 ff

ṇika's coins. Sten Konow identifies this 'maharajabhrata' with the brother of the Kushāṇa king who has the epithet of Mahārāja in the Khalatse inscription of very near date, 187.[1]

4. THE PARTHIANS AND INNER INDIA

It is not unlikely that after their expulsion from the north-western India some Parthians entered the inner parts of the country. Unfortunately, however, we have no definite evidence on this point. In the second century A. D. Suviśākha, the son of Kulaip, who is designated as Pahlava (Parthian), ruled over the whole of Ānarta and Surāshṭra under Rudradāman I.[2] At about the same time Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi, who claims mainly western India as his dominions, speaks of having destroyed the Pahlavas (Parthians) along with the Yavanas and the Śakas who must have come to western India upto this time. King Nahapāna of Surāshṭra and Kathiawar, and Mahākshatrapa Patika and Kharaosta of the Mathurā Lion Capital inscription, all of about this very time, are said to be Parthian names. Some scholars have gone still further and have attributed Parthian origin to king Śiśupāla[3] of Ghazipur district in eastern U. P., and to the Pallavas[4] of Kāñchī. Many scholars have already noted strong Parthian influence on the terracotta industry of the Gangetic valley in the first-second centuries A. D. Some kings bearing Hindu names on numerous coins of this time found in the Gangetic basin may be Hinduised Parthians.

1. Corpus, II, I, pp. 82-83. See also Lohuizen, S. P., p. 379. But Sir John Marshall (ASI, AR, 1929-30, pp. 63 ff) identifies him with Gondophernes.

2. Sircar, S. I., I, Junāgarh Ins. of Rudradāman I, p. 174.

3. Fleet, CII, III, p. 249 ff.

4. Weber, Hist. Ind. Lit., p. 183, note 201, Venkatayya, ASR, 1906-7, pp. 217 ff; D. C. Sircar, Successors of the Sātavāhanas, pp. 152 ff, H. C. Raychaudhuri. PHAI, 6, p. 500 fn. 2 and others.

CHAPTER VII

THE ŚAKAS

While the last five centuries before Christ are noteworthy in the world history for the rise of great empires and civilizations in western Asia and southern Europe, the next five centuries are remarkable for the devastatiug invasions on this area by barbarians emerging from vast steppes and deserts of central Asia. Three peoples among these barbarians invaded and occupied large parts of India. In order of chronology they are: the Śakas, the Kushāṇas and the Huṇas.

1. ORIGINAL HOME OF THE ŚAKAS

Indian literature gives us little information about the Śakas.[1] The Purāṇas, the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhāshya and some other works merely name them with the Yavanas, the Pahlavas, the Tushāras, the Hūṇas etc. as foreign barbarians (mlechchhas). Sometimes they give only certain fanciful details of the Śakas.[2] The Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas, and the Mahābhārata describe the home of the Śakas, Śakadvīpā, in the same manner. In their descriptions only the river Vaṁkshu and the Kshiroda Sea may be recognised with a little plausibility as the river Oxus and as the Caspian Sea which was called Shirwan in olden times. If these identifications be correct, then according to ancient Indian literature, the Śakas came to India from the Caspian region. This fact about the

1. See Satya Shrava, the Sakas in India, 1947.

2. Kālakāchārya Kathānaka and the verses of Merutuṅgāchārya, relied upon so much by some historians (see Konow, Corpus, II, pp. xxvi-xxxiii; Rapson, CHI, I, p. 532 and others), appear to us mere devices to explain the origin of the Vikrama era.

original home-land of the Śakas being situated in central Asia finds general corroboration from the Achaemenid inscriptions of the fifth century B. C., the Classical literature of the later half of the first millennium B.C., and certain Chinese histories of about the beginning of the Christian era.[1]

To Isidor of Charax, living about the opening of the Christian era, eastern Iran was known as Sakastan, the land of the Śakas.[2] From about this time the country near about the lower Indus valley also was called Scythia obviously due to its occupation by the Scythians, who ware most probably the Śakas.[3] By this time the Śakas appear to have spread over all these lands.

2. MIGRATION TO INDIA

The precise information about the original habitat of the Śakas and their migration to India comes from the Chinese annals which know them as the Sai, which became Sak or Sok in the pronunciation of the T'ang Period. In the oldest sources they are frequently spoken of as the Sai-wang.[4]

We read in the Ch'ien Han-Shu, the Annals of the Earlier Han Dynasty, "The Yue-chi had been conquered by the Hiung-nu and had, in the west, attacked the Sai-wang. The Sai-wang had fled southwards and settled in a distant country."[5] There are indications in the same work that the Yue-chi, being defeated by the Hiung-nu settled in the old Śaka country between 174-160 B. C. and that they were

1. For these all see Konow, CII, II, I, Introd.

2. The Parthian Stations, para 18.

3. Ptolemy, VII, 1, 55-62; *Dionysius Periegets*, V, 1088, and the Periplus, para 38.

4. Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese, Paris, 1923. See also Francke, JRAS, 1907 pp. 675 ff; and W. M. McGovern, Early Emp. Central Asia, 1935, p. 476.

5. See Konow, Corpus, II, I, pp. xx ff.

driven out of it shortly afterwards between 160 and 138 B.C.[1]

The Śaka exodus alluded to in the Ch'ien Han-Shu must accordingly fall between these two dates. Furthermore this work gives some references to the original home of the Śakas, from where they were expelled by the Yue-chi, to be in Zungaria which included the upper Ili river as well as the Issyk-kul lake regions.[2]

We further read in another place in the Ch'ien Han-Shu: "The Sai race split up and formed a series of states. From Shu-le (Kashgar) on towards the north-west what belongs to the states of Hiu-sun and Yuan-tu are all originally tribes of the old Sai."

The Chinese annals provide still more information about the Śakas. The Ch'ien Han-Shu runs, "The Great Yue-chi went towards the west and made themselves masters of Ta-hia but the Sai-wang went southwards and made themselves masters of Ki-pin." We also hear in the same place some thing about the route they followed, "The Sai-wang went towards the south and passed the Hien-tu (the hanging passage)." It is, of course, the southern route mentioned by some later works; as going from China westwards via Ts'ung-ling (the Pamirs) and Hien-tu to the country of the Yue-chi, whose empire at that time extended over a large part of India. According to Chavannes[3] this is the Bolor route through the Yasin valley, by which travellers

1. These dates have been given by three Japanese scholars who have made a special study of this subject namely, K. Shiratori, J. Kuwahora, and T. Fujita. Cf. Haloun, ZDMG, 1937, pp. 247 ff; Lohuizen, S. P., pp. 33 ff; and A. K. Narain, The Indo-Greeks, p. 133 fn 4.

2. See W. M. McGovern, The Early Empires of Central Asia, p. 476. This view is accepted by almost all historians. Only some of them (Thomas, JRAS, 1906, pp. 181 ff; Rapson, CHI, I, 567; Poussin, L'Inde aux Temps des Mauryas and des Barbares, p. 263 etc.) hold the view that the Sakas lived even in Seistan from very early times. But this view has been forcefully refuted by Sten Konow (Pavry Memorial Vol., p. 220), McGovern (l.c., p. 478) and many other scholars.

3. T'oung Pao, II, vi, p. 529 fn. 5.

went from Wakhan to the Indus and further to Kashmir and Udyana. Sten Konow[1] has suggested it to be the same route which the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hein followed. In his Serindia[2] Sir Aurel Stein shows how the pilgrim went from Kie-Ch'e (Kashgar) over the Pamirs to the country of T'o-li, modern Darel on the right bank of the Indus, opposite Chilas. Thence he followed the Indus towards the west.

According to the Chinese annals, after having passed the Hien-tu, the Sai-wang made themselves masters of Chi-pin, probably some part of the upper Indo-Kâbul region. We learn furthermore from these annals many things about the contacts of some kings of Chi-pin with the emperors of the last two centuries before Christ. These kings may be Śakas, as the Yue-chis, the only other people known to the Chinese to have ruled Chi-pin, had not yet reached this region.

Thus from a combined testimony of the Indian, Persian, Greek and Chinese sources it appears that before the second century B.C. the Śakas lived in central Asia. Afterwards they moved southwards and gradually passed to north-west India by the later part of the first century B. C. Unfortunately, however, we do not know the details of the Śaka rulers of north-western India. Even their coins and inscriptions are conspicuous by their absence in the upper Indo-Kâbul basin. So much so that some historians[3] think that they entered India

from central Asia via Kandahar, Seistan and the lower Indus valley, and that the most of Bactria and the upper Indo-Kābul valley was left untouched by them. It is only through the use of some names and titles associated with the Śakas that we recognise doubtfully some Śaka chiefs in north-western India.

3. THE ŚAKA KINGS OF THE NORTH-WEST

LIAKA

The Takshaśilā Copper Plate inscription[1] dated in the year 78 mentions Liaka Kuzulaka, who is characterized as a Kshaharāta and as Kshatrapa of Chukhsa, probably the present Cach in the north of the district of Attock immediately to the west of Takshaśilā.[2] Probably he is mentioned also in the Mānsehrā inscription[3] of the year 68 and in the Zeda inscription.[4] Liaka Kuzulaka is evidently the same person who had issued coins found near about Takshaśilā with the Greek legend Liaka Kozalao, imitating the 'pelie type' issues of Eucratides.[5] Besides the title Kshatrapa of the western Śaka Satrapas, Liaka had also the epithets Kshaharāta, associated with the earliest foreign kings of Kathiawar and Mālavā who were related to the Śakas, and Kuzulaka applied to the first Kushāṇa ruler of India.[6] Kuzula Liaka appears to have accepted sovereignty of Moga or Maues for some time probably towards the end of his life.

PATIKA

Liaka had a son, Patika, who is spoken of in the Copper

1. Konow, CII, p. 11.
2. Cunningham, AGI, 2nd ed., 63, p. 126. See also Buhler, Ep. Ind., IV, p. 54; and Konow, Corpus, II, i, pp. 25-28.
3. Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 257.
4. Corpus, II, i, p. 145.
5. Cunn., N.C., 3rd series, IX. 1889, p. 303, pl. XIII, 9.
6. See Konow, Corpus, II, i, pp. XXXII-XXXIII.

Plate as a great gift-lord (Mahādānapati).[1] According to Konow he is called in the same record as Jauva which is probably the same title which is used by the early Kushāṇa rulers, Yavuga. This writer furthermore informs us that as known from some Chinese sources this title was used in a series of principalities extending from Wakhan to Kābul, that is, the earlier Śaka habitat. A Mahākshatrapa Kuzulua Patika is mentioned among the inscriptions engraved on a Sandstone Lion Capital from Mathurā. It seems that Patika came to Mathurā from Takshaśilā.

We know of some more Kshatrapas in the north-west. A Manikiala inscription affords the bare mention of a satrapa of Kapisi, who was the son of the satrapa Granavhryaka.[2] A Kābul Museum stone inscription[3] of the year 83 discloses the name of a satrapa of Pushpapura named Tirauharna. 'Pushpapura,' the 'City of Flowers,' may have reference to Pushkalāvatī (Lotus City). The Shahdaur inscription in Hazara district of a rājan Damijada[4] perhaps mentions him as a Śaka, and gives the date as 60. The name of Sivasena, the kshatrapa of Abhisāraprastha, occurs in the legend of a copper seal-ring found in the Punjab.[5] A silver vase inscription[6] of the year 191, as also some coins, refer to Jihoṇika (Zioneses), a kshatrapa of Chukhsa (Takshaśila region) and to his father Manigula, who also is called satrapa and maharajabhrata. Another satrapa named Avakhajhada is mentioned in a relic casket inscription from Charsadda dated in the year 303.[7]

1. Ep. Ind., XXI, p. 257; and *JRAS*, 1932, p. 953 n.
2. Rapson, Andhra Coins, p. ci and Ancient India, p. 141; JASB, 1924, p. 14, and Corpus, II, i, pp. 150-151.
3. *Acta Orientalia*, xvi, Part III, 1937, pp. 234 ff.
4. Corpus, II, i, pp. 14, 16.
5. Corpus, II, i, p. 103.
6. Corpus, II, i, pp. 81 ff.
7. EI, XXXIV, 1937-38.

4. THE ŚAKA KINGS OF MATHURĀ

The Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions are perhaps the most important records of the Śakas in India. They bring to light a number of Śaka chiefs of this region. The main record on the Capital was engraved most probably in the time of mahākshatrapa Rājūla, whose chief queen got it inscribed. He has been identified with the mahākshatrapa Rājuvula of the Brāhmi inscription of the Mora stone-slab in the Mathurā Museum,[1] and with the ruler whose coins bear the Greek legend 'BASI EOSLSOTEROS RAZUBASILEI' where RAZUBASILEI may be a semi-Greek rendering of Rājuvula[2] on the obverse, and the Kharoshṭhī text 'apratihata-chakrasa kshatrapasa rajuvulasa' on the reverse. Other coins bear the legend 'mahakhatapasa rajuvulasa.'[3]

The coins show that Rājūla ruled a much wider area than Mathurā for he initiated coinages other than the local type of his predecessors here. Their findspots range from the valleys of the rivers forming the Indus to the Gangetic doab. They may be divided in three groups: (1) the drachms of light weight and very base metal copied exactly from the coins of Strato I and II; (2) the 'Hercules and a Lion' type used by Maues; and (3) the Lakshmi type resembling the issues of the so-called Hindu kings of Mathurā and those of Azilises. The first two types appear to be issued in the Punjab as indicated by their types and Kharoshṭhī legends. They have also been found in this area in large numbers. The scarcity of the coins of the third type suggests that Rājūl occupied Mathurā late in his reign for a short period from the local kings. It appears to us that Rājūla expelled Patika from Takshaśilā to Mathurā occupying the territories once ruled over by Maues. Later on he conquered some parts of

1. Luders' List, no. 14.

2. Andreas in Luder's, SBAW, 1913, pp. 424 ff.

3. Whitehead draws our attention to some coins giving the name as Rājul (PMC, I, p. 166 fn. 1.).

Strato's dominions also perhaps on being pressed eastwards by Azes I. Rājūla seems to have been ousted from his kingdom in the Punjab at the hands of Azes II or Gondophernes. He is very close to the latter kings by his coin-types and their metal.[1] In excavations at Takshaśilā his money has been found below the stratum which yielded the coins of Azes and Aspa*varman*.[2]

ŚUḌĀSA

The Mathurā Lion Capital inscr.ption contains the name of Rājūla's son, kshatrapa Śuḍāsa. He is also mentioned in two Brāhmi inscriptions :[3] one from the Jail mound, mentioning the treasurer (garijavara) of the svâmin mahakshatrapa Soṁḍāsa, the other from Kankāli Tilā being dated in the year 72 or 42[4] of svāmin mahākshatrapa Śoḍāsa. To us this date of Śuḍās seems to refer to the so-called Vikrama era with one hundred omitted. Then the reign of Śuḍāsa would come about the beginning of the second century A. D.

Coins of Śoḍāsa (identified with Śuḍāsa) imitate only the Lakshmi type of his father prevailing in Mathurā and they are not found in the Punjab. Their legend also is in Brāhmi alone. It shows that his rule was limited only to the Mathurā region. They bear the legends describing Śuḍāsa as (1) kshatrapa, son of the mahākshatrapa; (2) kshatrapa, son of Rājuvula; and (3) mahākshatrapa. The first two types were perhaps issued in his father's life time, and the last when he succeeded him as the great kshatrapa. In this case the scarcity of the third type would indicate a short reign as the mahākshatrapa.

1. Whitehead, op. cit., pp. 131-151 and 106 and in Marshall's Taxila p. 838; Gardner, op. cit., pp. 73, 103, and Jenkins, JNSI, 1955, pp. 19-20.
2. ASI, AR, 1928 29, p. 64.
3. Luders' List, Nos. 59 and 62.
4. Luders (Ep. Ind., ix, pp. 243 ff) reads the date as 72 with almost all other historians. Prof. Rapson, however, reads it 42 (CHI, I, p. 575 and Indian Studies in the Lanman Comm. Vol., Cambridge 1929, pp. 49-52).

TORANADASA

A coin belonging to a hitherto unknown satrapa bears the legend 'mahākshatapasa puttasa khatapasa (T (o) ra) nadasasa'. It closely resembles the coins of Śuḍāsa, and, in view of the mention of an unnamed son of Rājūla in the Mora inscription,[1] John Allan[2] is inclined to think of this satrapa as the brother of Śuḍāsa.

KHARAOSTA

The inscription on the Lion Capital twice mentions a yuvarāja, i.e. heir-apparent, Kharaosta. According to Sten Konow[3] he was the father-in-law, and according to Fleet[4] a grandson (daughter's son) of Rājūla and consequently a nephew of Śuḍāsa. His known coins are of two types presenting the Greek legend "characostei arta u (io)u" on the obverse, and the Kharoshṭhī legend "Kshatrapasa pra kharaostasa artasa (or once ortasa) putrasa".

The Lion Capital contains the names of several more Śaka chiefs who are not known from any other source, such as kshatrapa Mevaki, Mivika,[5] kshatrapa Khardao, Takshila Kronina and perhaps Khalasamuśa.

GHATĀKA

A fragmentary inscription found by Vogel on the site of Ganeshrā near Mathurā revealed the name of a satrapa of the Kshaharâta family called Ghatāka.[6]

1. ASR, AR, 1911-12, p. 127 and EI, XXIV, p. 194 ff.
2. Brit. Mus. Cat. Coins of Anc. Ind., Introd., p. cxii, para 126.
3. Corpus, II, I, pp. XXXV-XXXVI.
4. JRAS, 1913, pp. 919, 1000.
5. A coin bearing the name Mewaku has been traced by Rapson (JRAS, 1894, p. 548). But John Allan says it to be an issue of Śoḍāsa (Brit. Mus. Cat. Coins of Ancient India, pp. cxiv-cxv).
6. ASI, AR, 1912-13, pp. 123 ff and JRAS, 1912, p. 121.

HAGĀNA, HAGĀMASHA, ŚIVAGHOSHA AND ŚIVADATTA

Two more kshatrapas are known from their coins found in Mathurā region namely, Hagāna and Hagāmasha. Smith thinks that they were brothers and preceded Rājūla.[1] But only Brāhmī legend on their coins suggests that they flourished after Rājūla and Suḍāsa. Two more kshatrapas known from a few coins of the same type are Śivaghosha and Śivadatta. On the obverse of all these coins appears the figure of Lakshmī and on the reverse that of a horse.

5. THE WESTERN KSHAHARĀTAS AND KSHATRAPAS

The Western kshaharātas and kshatrapas, who ruled over the whole of south-western India from the lower Indus basin to eastern Mālavā and thence to Mahārāshṭra from about second century A. D. to the fourth century A. D., were most probably Śaka by nationality. Nahapāna, the greatest of the kshaharāta satrapas, no doubt, has a Persian name, but the Kshaharāta tribe to which he belonged was probably of Śaka extraction,[2] and Ushavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, distinctly calls himself a Śaka in his records.[3] There is still better evidence for the Śaka nationality of the Western Kshatrapas of Chashṭana's house. Besides the name of their progenitor Ysmotika and the name endings of many of them —ghsada being clearly Scythic, the ruler of their dynasty, who was killed by Chandragupta II, is called by Bāṇa in his Harshacharita a Śaka king (Śakapati).[4] The silver coins both of Nahapāna and of Chashṭana and of the

1. Cat. Coins Ind. Mus., Calcutta, I, p. 190.

2. Strabo mentions a Saka tribe named Karatai which seems to be quite near in name to Kshaharāts or Khaharāts (See H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, p. 434 and S. Chattopadhyaya, The Sakas in India, p. 52).

3. See the Nāsik records Nos. 12 and 14 (Rapson, Cat. Coins. Western Kshatrapas, Andhras etc., pp. LVII ff and E. I., VIII, pp. 81 and 85).

4. See Rapson, Cat. Coins Andhras etc., p. CV. for other proofs.

latter's successors are copied from the hemidrachms of the Greek princes of the Punjab and seem to follow the same weight standard. The traces of north-western origin of these Kshatrapas are to be seen also in Greek characters and kharoshṭhī inscriptions on their coins. An image[1] found at Mūt near Mathurā is inscribed Sashṭana, who is identified with Chashṭana. Probably it shows that Chashṭana ruled in Mathurā before coming to the south-west India. He might have been expelled from Mathurā by the Kushāṇas.

6. THE ŚAKA CHIEFS OF INNER INDIA

The above discussion proves that about the opening of the Christian era the Śakas occupied the whole of north-western and western India. A number of Śaka chiefs ruled over the Indus valley, West U. P., Rājasthān, Gujarāt, Kāṭhiāwār, Surāshṭra, Mahārāshṭra and western Madhya Pradesh for hundreds of years. It is but natural that some of them passed into inner parts of north and south India especially under the pressure of the Kushāṇas.

From some inscriptions of Kanishka we learn that some kshatrapas and mahākshatrapas were working under him in certain parts of the country. Probably they were local Śaka chiefs who had accepted Kushāṇa overlordship. While his Manikiala (Rawalpindi district) inscription refers to kshatrapa Vespasi, the Zeda (near Und in the Punjab) record mentions kshatrapa Liaka. The Sārnāth (near Vārāṇasī in U.P.) inscription alludes to mahākshatrapa Kharapallāna and kshatrapa Vanashpara.[2] The former is mentioned in one

more undated record from the same place, which has yielded *two more records of a kshatrapa named Aśvaghosha.*[1]

There is even some literary evidence for the Śaka penetration into the Gangetic basin. The Yugapurāna which describes the history of Magadha after the fall of the Mauryan empire refers to a powerful Śaka king. According to it this king ruled after the Yavanas and was perhaps killed in a war against the rulers of Kaliṅga.[2] The Śakas are mentioned once more in this work.[3] The other old Purāṇas[4] refer to 18 Śaka rulers with the Andhras and the Gardabhins who are most probably the Western Kshatrapas. They further mention 18 Muruṇḍas with the Yavanas, Tushāras and Hūṇas. The Muruṇḍas appear to have ruled over Kanauj, Patna and some other places in the early Christian centuries on the evidence of some other works also.[5] From the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta as well as from some other sources we learn that muruṇḍa was most probably a title of the Śaka kings. It is, no doubt, a Śaka word meaning 'master' or 'king'.[6]

There is some evidence even for the expansion of the Śakas to South India. A Sāñchī inscription discloses the existence of a Śaka principality which was ruled over in the

---

Mathurā. He further thinks that Kharapallāna might be the satrap of Mathurā, though, in his opinion, Kharapallāna's son Vanashpara probably resided at Vārāṇasi. The image might have been brought from Mathurā. But we think that the inscription commemorating its installation at Sārnāth can hardly refer to the ruler of Mathurā rather than that of Sārnāth where the image was set up The presence of another record of Kharapallāna at Sārnāth proves his authority in this region.

1. Luders' List, Nos. 925, 926.

2. Yugapurāṇa by Mankad, lines 124-125.

3. Ibid., line 180.

4. Pargiter, PTDKA, pp. 45-47, 72.

5. See Allan, Gupta Coins, p. xxix; and S. Chattopadhyaya, The Sakas in India, 1955, pp. 8 ff.

6. Lohuizen, S. P., p. 46.

3rd-4th centuries A. D. by the mahādaṇḍanāyaka Śrīdharavarman, son of Nanda.[1] Some Śaka chiefs are known from certain inscriptions to hold sway over Tripuri,[2] Nāgārjunikoṇḍa[3] and the Narmadā valley.[4] A few coins of Śaka kings named Mana, Chutuka etc. have been found in the excavations at Koṇḍāpur and Maski in the southern parts of Hyderabad state.[5]

Ultimately the Śakas were Hinduised as indicated by the Indian names of the later Śaka chiefs. Hence it becomes difficult to recognise them.

CHAPTER VIII

THE KUSHĀNA

Epigraphic and numismatic evidence indicates that the Śaka and Parthian rule in India was supplanted by that of the Kushāṇa dynasty. The Kushāṇas are generally identified with the chiefs of Kuei-shuang (Kouei-chouang) principality who were a section of the Yue-chi race. The Chinese historians provide us some information about the early history of this race.

1. EARLY HISTORY OF THE YUE-CHIS

We learn from the Chinese historians that[1] nearabout the land watered by the Tarim river, usually known as Chinese Turkistan or Kashgaria, there lived a number of tribes in the fourth and third centuries B. C. The extreme eastern and north-eastern parts of this region, adjoining the Hunnish dominions in Mongolia, were occupied by two tribes, called Wusun and Yue-chi.[2] These tribes were still in the nomadic stage with a steppe culture similar

1. For the early history of the Yue-chi prior to their arrival in India, see the Chinese works Tung Chien Chang Mu, 126 B. C; Shi ki, 91 B. C.; Ch'ien Han shu, 92 A. D.; and Hou Han-shu, 445 A. D. The relevant portions of these works have been translated by several scholars. Our account depends mainly on the information supplied by Sten Konow, *Corpus, II, I, Introd., pp. XVI ff* and W. M McGovern, *the Early Empires* of Central Asia, 1936, especially pp. 110-131 and 475-485.

2. Rapson (CHI, I, p. 565), Smith (EHI, 4, p. 248), Charpentier (ZDMG, LXXI, 1917, p. 352) and most of the Indian historians depending on the works of these scholars say that the Yue-chis met the Wusun in the country of the upper Ili river, now called Kulja, on their way westwards from their original home in Chinese Turkistan after their defeat by the Hiung-nu. But McGovern (Early Emp. Cent. Asia, p. 376) shows that the original Chinese texts speak of the Yue-chi living with the Wusun in the Chinese *Turkistan* where they defeated the Wusun later on, and then *marched to* Zungaria containing the upper Ili river basin and Issyk kul lake region where later on the Wusun defeated the Yue-chi and ousted them from there.

in all essential respects to that of their Turanian neighbours, the Hūṇas.

In the third century B. C. the Hūṇas or the Hiung-nus, as they were called, were tending towards imperialism. Their king Touman who flourished towards the end of this century welded all the Hūṇa tribes into a mighty nation. It was reserved for parricide son, the great conqueror Maodun (209-174 B. C.), to transform their nation into a vast empire spreading over almost the whole of Central Asia. Shanyu (emperor) Maodun was succeeded by his son Giyu (174-160 B. C.) whose attack upon the Yue-chi compelled them to move wetward and change the whole course of history in India, Persia and the adjoining countries.

As already pointed out, the Yue-chis were nomads living in north-eastern Kashgaria covering the present province of Kanshu in north-eastern China. They were more or less hereditary enemies of the Hūṇas, for we know of at least one attack made on them by Touman, the first of the Shanyus of whom we have record, and of at least two campaigns carried out by his son, Maodun, the real founder of the Hunnish empire. Maodun was successful in defeating the Yueh-chi, and in reducing them to a state of vassalage, but the latter were still far from being crushed. Some time during Giyus' reign, the Yue-chis must have made an attempt to reassert their independence, for we hear of a final great campaign of the Hūṇas against the Yue-chis in which Giyu succeeded in completely crushing his enemy. Having captured and killed the king of the Yue-chi, he made of the latter's skull a ceremonial drinking vessel which was used by Giyu and his successors for many generations thereafter. This overwhelming defeat[1] caused the complete col-

lapse of the Yue-chi kingdom as it was then constituted, A small portion of the Yue-chi fled to the south and *took* refuge among the Tibetan (Kiang) tribes of the Nanshan mountains. This group was known as the Little Yue-chi. The bulk of the Yue-chis fled, however, far in the north-west to the Zungaria basin and *there they* settled along the banks of the upper Ili river and near the shores of the lake *Issyk-kul. Before establishing* themselves in this region, the Yue-chis of course drove out the Śakas, the previous occupants of shis area.[1]

The Yue-chi were not, however, to be left long in the possession of their new home. Only a few years later they were subjected to a new attack on the part of the Wusuṅ. It will be remembered that the Wusun were formerly neighbours of the Yue-chi in eastern Kashgaria. Both peoples had been attacked and defeated by the great Hunnish Shanyu, Maodun. Shortly after this the Yue-chi and the Wusun *fell to fighting among themselves. The Yue-chi gave the* Wusun a sound thrashing and slew the Wusun ruler. The Wusun then fled to the north and took refuge with the Hūṇas. The heir to the Wusun throne, about whom many marvellous stories are told, grew up as a page in the Hunnish court. There he so won the affections of the Shanyu, who can have been hardly other than Giyu, that the latter not only placed the young man on his father's throne as lord of the Wusun, but also aided him in his desire to avenge his *father's death, that is, of course in attacking the Yue-chi.* In the mean time the Yue-chi, as we know, had abandoned their old home and had settled in Zungaria. Undeterred by this fact, the young man led his forces *to the west. Here*

1. Most of the Indian historians following Rapson, Smith and Charpentier (l. c.) say that the Yue-chi divided themselves in the upper Ili basin from where they expelled the Wusun and that they settled in the Issyk-kul region at the cost of the Sakas to be ousted from there later on by the Wusun. McGovern has, however, shown that the Chinese texts really speak of the fight of the Yue-chi with the Wusun (Han-shu, 61, 4 a) and their division into two branches (Ibid., 96 b) in the very beginning of their migration from their original home in Kashgar (l. c., pp. 476 f).

he succeeded in inflicting such a defeat upon the Yue-chi that the latter were again forced to migrate still further to the west. After achieving this victory the Wusun themselves settled down in Zungaria, in which region they continued to dwell for several centuries until they disappear from history. The Yue-chi moved on and over-ran and occupied Sogdia and what the Chinese chroniclers called Ta-hia and which is generally identified with Bactria.

The Chinese got more information about the Yue-chi through Chang-k'ien who was sent westwards in order to enlist the assistance of the Yue-chi against the Hūṇas by the Chinese emperor Wu-di the Great (140-187 B. C.), who not only organised the old loose Chinese empire in a strong unit, but even expanded it greatly to touch the Hūṇa empire in the north. Starting on his mission in 138 B. C., Chang-k'ien, detained on his way by the Hūṇas for about ten years, at last reached the Yue-chi living on the Oxus, and returned home in 126 B. C. The adventures of Ghang-k'ien are related by Ssu-ma-ch'ien in the Sse-ke or Shi-ki completed before B. C. 91. In this work the new country of the Yue-chi is said to be rich and fertile, and the people peaceful and happy. Their capital was Kien-she to the north of the Oxus, and they had made themselves masters of Ta-hia whose capital was Lan-shi, to the south of the river.

The itinerary of Chang-k'ien is re-told in Pan-ku's Ch'ien Han-shu or Annals of the First Han Dynasty that deals with the period B. C. 206-A. D. 9 or 24, and was completed by Pan-ku's sister after his death in A. D. 92. This work adds about Ta-hia that there were five principalities, each under one hi-hou, which all depended on the Ta Yue-chi, viz., Hiu-mi (possibly Wakhan, between the Pamirs and the Hindukush), Choungmi or Shuangmi (Chitral, south of Wakhan and the Hindukush), Kouei-chouang or Kuei-shuang (the Kushāṇa principality probably situated

between Chitral and the Panjshir country), Hitum (Parwan on the Panjshir) and Kao-fou (Kābul).[1]

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yue-chi in Fan-ye's Hou Han-shu or Annals of the Later Han Dynasty which covers the period between A. D. 25 and 220. Fan-ye who died in 442 A. D. states: "The notes which Pan-ku has written on the configuration and manner of the various (western) countries are detailed in the book of the older (Han); now I have chosen that in the events of the period Kien-wu (A. D. 25-55) or later was different from what has already been said formerly, and I have compared the chapters on the western countries on that; all the facts have been related by Pan-yung at the end of the reign of the emperor Ngan (A. D. 107-125)." It is accordingly the events of the period A. D. 25-125 which are narrated by Fan-ye. The capital of the Yue-chi is now the old Ta-hia capital Lan-shi in Badakhśan to the south of the Oxus which remained their stronghold down to the fifth century of our era.[2]

Fan-ye further states: "In old days the Yue-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nu. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the[3] kingdom among five Hsi-h(e)ous or Yabgous, viz., those of Hsiumi, Shuangmi, Kuei-shuang, Hsitun and Tumi. More than hundred years after that, the hsi-hou or Yabgou (Yavuga) of Kuei-shuang (Kushāṇa) named K'iu-tsiu-k'io attacked and annihilated the four other hsi-hous and

1. For the proposed identifications see Sten Konow, Corpus, II, I, p. LVI; and EI, XXI, p. 258 ff.

2. Konow, Corpus, II, I, p. LXV and JIH, XII, 1933, p. 11.

3. Some scholars namely, Kuwabara Jitsuzo (Cf JAOS, Vol. 65, 1945, p. 72), Haneda Toru (Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise, 1933, pp. 1-11); Sten Konow (JIH, 1933, pp 1 ff); and Paul Pelliot (JA, 1934, pp. 38 ff) think that the Yue-chis did not divide Ta hia relying mainly on a passage of Ch'ien Han-shu which is said by them to refer to the existence of five hi hous in Bactria before the arrival of the Yue-chis. But this interpretation has now been shown to be a misunderstanding and there is little valid ground to question this statement of Hou Han-shu (See Otto Maenchen Helfen, JAOS, Vol. 65, 1945, pp. 72 78). In fact the passage of the Ch'ien Han shu also refers to division of Ta-hia after immigration of the Yue-chi, though not so clearly.

made himself king or lord (wang) ; he invaded Ngan-si (Parthia) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fu (Kābul), overcame Po-ta and Chi-pin and became complete master of these kingdoms. K'iu-tsiu-k'io died at the age of more than eighty. His son Yen-kao-tchen succeeded him as king. In his turn he conquered T'ien-chu (India) and established there a chief for governing it. From this time the Yue-chi became extremely powerful. All the other countries designated them Kushāṇa after their king, but the Han retained the old name and called them Ta Yue-chi."[1]

It will be seen that instead of Kao-fu in the Ch'ien Han-shu this work gives Tu-mia as the name of the fifth Kushāna principality in Ta-hia. It is stated clearly by Fan-ye elsewhere[2] that it is a mistake of the Ch'ien Han-shu to mention Kao-fu among the five principalities which was only at a later date included in the Kushāṇa empire: "Kao-fu (Kābul) was never dependent on the Yue-chi, and it was therefore a mistake of the Han book (i. e. Ch'ien Han-shu) when it includes it among the five hi-hous. Later on it fell under the dependency of An-hsi (Parthia), and it was when the Yue-chi triumphed over An-hsi that they for the first time took Kao-fu."

2. KUJULA KADPHISES

From the Hou Han-shu it is clear that the Kuei-shuang principality was made the starting point of a development which led to the establishment of a large empire in India and in the Indian border-lands. The name of the founder of this empire has been given as K'iu-tsiu-k'io which was pronounced in the T'ang period K'iu-dziu-kip.[3] It is evidently identical with Kushāṇa Kujūla Kapa known from coins,

4. Konow, l. c., p. LXV.

1. The Hou Han shu, chapt. 118. Cf. Konow, Corpus. II, i, p. LV, and Marshall, JRAS, 1947, p. 126,

2. Karlgren, Nos. 406, 252m, 491.

It seems that Kujūla's kingdom, comprising of the five Yue-chi hi-hous and parts of the upper Indo-Kābul valley, bordered upon the dominions of the Indo-Parthian rulers of the Indus basin. Most probably Kujūla defeated these rulers *and controlled their activities. The Chinese text speaks of* his mastery over Chi-pin and Pota which may be situated in the upper Indus basin. The itinerary of Apollonius of Tyana informs us that at the time of his visit to Takshaśilā in the middle of the first century A. D. the Parthian monarch ruling there paid tribute to some northern barbarian king for protection of his kingdom from his hordes.[1]

All these conquests of Kujūla have been said to have occurred more than one hundred years after the establishment of five Yue-chi principalities in Ta-hia, that is, some time after 126 B. C. when Chang-k'ien did not find them there. The Chinese historian Fan-ye who describes these events deals with the happenings which took place in and after the Kien-wu period (A. D. 25-55) upto 125 A. D. This suggests the first century A. D. as the time of these occurrences. Referred to the so-called Vikrama era, the years 103, 122 and 136 of the inscriptions, mentioning a Kushāṇa king in north-western India, will fall within the same period.

From the stratigraphy of the coins of Kujūla found at Takshaśilā it appears that Kujūla began to exercise much influence from the time of the last Parthian kings, namely Azes II, Gondophernes, Sapendanes and Satavastra.[2] These coins are only in copper and contain the titles yavuga (chief),

1. We cannot say definitely that the Takshaśilā region occupied by the Parthian kings lay in Chi-pin and Pota or not. Sir John Marshall (ASI, AR, 1929-30, pp. 55-56) puts it out of Chi-pin and Pota and within Tien-chu which is said to have been conqered by Kujula's successor Wima in the Chinese texts. But in that case it becomes a bit difficult to explain appearance of Kujula's name in the Indo-Parthian inscriptions and presence of his coins on the Parthian stratum at Takshaśilā. Marshall's theory that Kujula first conquered Takshaśilā from the Parthians and then lost it to them does not appear to be satisfactory.

2. ASI, AR, 1912-3, p. 41; Ibid 1929-30 pp. 55-56.

mahārāja (the great king), rājātirāja (the king of kings) and sachadhramathita (steadfast in the true faith) in Kharoshṭhī on the reverse with corrupt Greek on the obverse. They show unmistakable influence of Rome. In one class of them appears a Roman head which is palpably imitated from that of Augustus (B. C. 27-A. D. 14), or Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), or Claudius (A.D. 41-54).[1] Another class of very common coins shows Kadphises with Hermaeus, the last Graeco-Bactrian king of the upper Kābul valley. Some of them bear on the obverse the bust and Greek legend of Hermaeus, and on the reverse the legend *of the Kushāṇa king in Kharoshṭhī.* Others bear the bust of Hermaeus with the legends of Kadphises on the obverse as well as reverse. Still others show not only the legends of Kadphises but even a bust different from that of Hermaeus. It may be inferred from these coins that Kadphises copied the coins of Hermaeus current long after his death through their imitations by the barbarian kings who happened to occupy this region.

3. WIMA KADPHISES

According to the Hou Han-shu, K'iu-tsiu-k'io or Kujūla Kadphises was succeeded by his son Yen-kao-tchen. In T'ang pronunciation this name comes to be Iam-Kau-t'ien.[2] It is apparently Wima Kadphises in Kharoshṭhī and Ooemo Kadphises in Greek of coins, Uvima Kavthisa of the Kharoshṭhī inscription of the year 187 or 184 found at Khalatse.[3] and probably also Vama-taksham of a Brāhmī inscription found at Māt near Mathurā with the titles mahārāja rājātirāja

1. JRAS, 1912, p. 679; and 1913, p. 912; Smith, Catalogue, p. 66, and Camb. Short. Hist., p. 74.

2. Karlgren, Nos. 247, 803 and 1191.

3. Konow, Acta Orient., XX, 1949, pp. 117-119 and Lohuizen, S. P., p. 27. But F. W. Thomas (Gottingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, Jrg. 193, 1931, p. 4) and Rapson (JRAS, 1930, p. 191) doubt this reading.

devaputra Kushāṇoputra.[1] Referred to the Vikrama era, the Khalatse inscription places his reign about 130 A. D.

Of Wima we learn that he conquered T'ien-chu and appointed a general there for its administration. The Chinese expression T'ien-chu or Shen-tu or in T'ang pronunciation Sien-d'uok[2] is clearly Sindhu, the old name of India. But this term has been applied to various parts of the Indo-Kābul region, and it is not easy to be quite definite about the territories precisely indicated by it. Fortunately, however, the Hou Han-shu itself gives a description of this country. The text runs: "The kingdom T'ien-chu is also called Shen-tu. The kingdom is situated on the banks of a great river. The inhabitants mount on the elephants in war, they are weaker than the Yue-chi; they practise the religion of the Buddha; it has become a habit wlth them not to kill and not to fight. Parting from Kao-fu, which belongs to the Yue-chi, and turning towards the south-west one comes to the western sea, in the east one comes to the kingdom of P'an-k'i;[3] all these countries form part of Shen-tu. Shen-tu has several hundred other towns (besides the capital); in each town a governor has been appointed; there are several tens of other kingdoms (besides the principal kingdom); in each kingdom there is a king. Thouh one observes some small differences in each of their kingdoms, they are nevertheless all called Shen-tu. At that time (i. e. probably when Pan-yung wrote, or towards A.D. 125) they were all depen-

1. ASI, AR, 1911-12, pp. 120 ff The inscription is engraved on an image with the features like those of the inscribed image of Kanishka found at the same site. The image has been identified with Kadphises II (Vogel, La Sculpture de Mathurā, Ars Asiatica, XV, 1930, pl. XI; J. N. Banerjea, JNSI, IX, 1947, pp 78; Daya Ram Sahni, JRAS, 1924, pp. 401 ff; K. P. Jayaswal, JBORS, 1910, pp. 93 99, Lohuizen, S. P., p. 380 and others). A. S. Altekar (JNSI, XII, p 122) also thinks that Wima's dominions extended upto Magadha.

2. Karlgren Nos. 869, 645.

3. T'ang pronunciation is b'uan-k'ji (Karlgren, nos. 690, 319). Chavannes puts this country in Annam or Burma (Toung Pao, II, VIII, p. 193). But probably some territory in the Gangetic basin is meant.

dant on the Yue-chi ; the Yue-chi had killed the king and installed a general to govern the population."[1]

Though this description is somewhat obscure, it seems clear that the country conquered by Wima was situated on the Indus, and most probably it contained the whole of the Indus basin stretching from the Kābul valley to the sea.

We learn from some Tibetan sources[2] that shortly after A. D. 120 the Khotan king Vijayakīrti, son of Vijayasiṁha, joined king Kanika[3] and the king of Guzan in an expedition to India, on which the city of Soked (Sāket) was overthrown. Here Guzan seems to be Kushāṇa (Gushana) and we have probably a reference to Wima, who was the Kushāṇa king in the Oxus-Kābul-Indus region at this time according to the Hou Han-shu and also the Khalatse inscription of the year 187 or 184 referred to the so-called Vikrama era.

Another passage in the Hou Han-shu refers to the conquest of some more territories by the Yue-chi, lying to the much south east of 'India' (the Indus basin), which might be near about Sāket. As Wima is the only Yue-chi ruler known to the Hou Han-shu who could conquer this land, it is very probable that it describes the conquests of Wima. The passage states : "Tong-li was over 3000 li south east of T'ien-chu or Shen-tu, the country we have already described. It was a great kingdom, its produce and its climate were like that of T'ien-chu. There were several dozen of towns

1. Cf. Konow. Corpus, II, 1, p. LXVII.

2. See Rockhill, The Life of Buddha, pp. 237 ff; The Tibetan Historical Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkistan, 1935, p. 119; and Thomas, IA, XXXII, 1903, p. 349. Tārānath, as stated by Thomas (ibid.), distinguishes this Kanika from Kanishka I. He is not, however, totally reliable as he puts Kanishka in the Mauryan period and says that Kanishka became king in Mālavā and Tili.

3. Konow (Corpus, II, i, pp. LXXV and LXXVIII) identifies king Kanishka with the Khotan king Kien. But the Tibetan source has mentioned Vijayakirti as the name of the Khotan king. Moreover, the name Kien does not exactly correspond to Kanishka. It appears too far fetched to believe the identification of a king of Khotan with a king of India inspite of complete absence of epigraphic and numismatic affinity especially

of the first rank; the chief of each had the title of king. The Yue-chi had attacked this kingdom and reduced it to subjection."[1]

Wima had a bilingual gold and copper coinage. The obverse design gives us a new life-like representation of the monarch while the reverse is confined to the worship of Śiva. The obverse Greek legend is corrupt, and the reverse Kharoshṭhī legend calls Wima 'the great king, the king of kings, lord of the whole world, the Maheśvara, the defender.' These coins are found over a very extensive region from the Oxus valley, the Kābul valley and Kandahar in the west to the whole of Indus basin in the east and even to upper parts of the Gangetic basin, upto Bhīṭā, Kauśāmbī,[2] Buxar[3] and Basāṛh.[4] A gold coin of Wima showing him on an elephant probably indicates his conquest of Indian territories.[5]

4. KANISHKA I

The early Chinese annalists, who are our only reliable source of information for the Kushāṇa empire in India, become cempletely silent after describing the exploits of Yen-kao-tchen or Wima Kadphises. There are, no doubt, occasional references to some Yue-chi kings in the later Chinese literature in connection with narration of China's relations with the western countries of Yarkand, Kashgar, Tibet etc.,

---

when one of them has left numerous inscriptions and coins. McGovern says that "Incidentally, though agreeing with Konow's dating, his suggestion that Kanishka is to be identified with Kien, the petty ruler of Khotan, circa A. D. 150 (see the Hou Han-shu, 118, 9-10) is to be dismissed as ridiculous". (EECA p. 485).

1. Chavannes, pp. 48-49. Cf. JRAS, 1912, pp. 677-678. Kennedy indentifies Tong-li of this passage with Magadha. See also F. W. Thomas, New Ind. Ant., VII, 1944.

2. ASI, AR, 1911-12, p. 6.

3. JNSI, XII, 1950, p. 122.

4. ASI, AR, 1913-14, pp. 122, 131.

5. Brit. Mus. Quarterly, VIII, p. 73.

but we cannot be certain about their association with Indian Yue-chis. It is only through the stratigraphy of coins at Takshaśilā that we learn that Wima was followed by the king named Kanishka. The latter also calls himself Kushāṇa on his coins and bears some of the titles of the early Kushāṇa kings such as mahārāja, rājātirāja, and devaputra. But his relationship with these kings is not known definitely.

Several epigraphic records give us definite contemporary notices of Kanishka. With their dates ranging from the year 1 to 23, they show a long reign for Kanishka from 144 to 167 A. D. according to the system of chronology adopted in these pages.[1] Found all over the Indo-Gangetic bsin from Peshawar to Śrāvastī, they indicate inclusion of almost the whole of northern India in the empire of Kanishka. The coins of Kanishka are found in considerable quantities all over a still vaster region from the Oxus valley, the Kābul valley, Kandahar and Sind in the west to as far eastwards as the eastern-most districts of U. P. and some also in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. They have been imitated clearly by the kings of Kashmir, north-west India, Gupta dynasty, Nepal and Orissa.

Kanishka thus seems to be a great emperor. But his fame rests not so much on his conquests as on his partronage of Northern Buddhism. In the literature[2] of this religion he is greatly celebrated for his Buddhist activities. All this literature is, however, full of unreliable religious stories and even a few facts of historical interest emanating from it, which are in some cases contradictory to one another, may hardly be taken to be certain. According to the combined testimony of all this literature Kanishka was a northern king

1. See the Appendix.

2. For some of the references see M. Levi. JA, VIII, 1896, pp. 444 ff, IX, 1897 pp 526 ff, IA, XXXII, 1903, pp. 381 ff, XXXIII, 1904, pp. 110 ff; JA, CCXI, 1927, pp. 97 ff; Thomas, IA, XXXII, 1903, pp. 349 ff; K. P. Jayaswal, Imperial Hist. India (AMMK), pp. 41 ff, H. W. Bailey, JRAS, 1942, pp. 14 ff and 1949, pp. 2 ff. The Itineraries of Fa-hien and Yuan-Chwang.

born in Kiu-sha family. In another place he has been said to come of a royal family of Bahalaka in Tokharistan. He ruled over very wide realms comprising all the "three regions" and the whole of Jumbūdvīpa. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāket) and Pāṭaliputra in the east, Parthia in the west, and Khotan in the north are preserved in many works. He received hostages even from a Chinese state to the west of the Yellow River. The great king built a wonderful tower in his capital at Purushapuri[1] and convoked the last Great Buddhist council which systematized the Northern Buddhist scriptures. The court of this king is said to have been adorned by Pārśva, Vasumitra, Aśvaghosha, Charaka, Nāgārjuna and "other worthies who played a leading part in the religious, literary, scientific, philosophical and artistic activities of his age." According to a tradition he was assassinated by his officers while on an expedition in the north.

VĀŚISHKA

While the last inscription of Kanishka is dated in the year 23, the first month of the summer season,[2] a record from Mathurā, dated in the year 24,[3] the fourth month of the summer season, belongs to the reign of Vāśishka. The natural inference is that Kanishka died in the interval between the summer of 23 and that of 24, and that he was succeeded by Vāśishka. There are two more inscriptions of Vāśishka[4] fouud at Sāñchī, one of which is dated in the year 28 which is also the year of an epigraph of his successor Huvishka. Probably during his short reign of three or four

1. Excavations at Shāh-ji-ki-Dheri near Peshawar (ASI, AR, 1908-9, pp. 89 ff) have brought to light an inscription mentioning Agis'ala as the overseer of works at Kanishka vihāra in the Saṃghārāma of Mahāsena.

2. ASI, AR, 192 1, p. 85.

3. Luders' List, No. 142 a.

4. *One more inscription of Rajano Vas-Khushana dated in the year* 22 has been attributed to him (C. Krishnamacharlu, Proc. Ind. Hist. Cong resn., 7th, pp. 135-6). But obviously there can be no certainty.

born in Kiu-sha family. In another place he has been said to come of a royal family of Bahalaka in Tokharistan. He ruled over very wide realms comprising all the "three regions" and the whole of Jumbūdvīpa. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāket) and Pāṭaliputra in the east, Parthia in the west, and Khotan in the north are preserved in many works. He received hostages even from a Chinese state to the west of the Yellow River. The great king built a wonderful tower in his capital at Purushapuri[1] and convoked the last Great Buddhist council which systematized the Northern Buddhist scriptures. The court of this king is said to have been adorned by Pārśva, Vasumitra, Aśvaghosha, Charaka, Nāgārjuna and "other worthies who played a leading part in the religious, literary, scientific, philosophical and artistic activities of his age." According to a tradition he was assassinated by his officers while on an expedition in the north.

VĀŚISHKA

While the last inscription of Kanishka is dated in the year 23, the first month of the summer season,[2] a record from Mathurā, dated in the year 24,[3] the fourth month of the summer season, belongs to the reign of Vāśishka. The natural inference is that Kanishka died in the interval between the summer of 23 and that of 24, and that he was succeeded by Vāśishka. There are two more inscriptions of Vāśishka[4] fouud at Sāñchī, one of which is dated in the year 28 which is also the year of an epigraph of his successor Huvishka. Probably during his short reign of three or four

1. Excavations at Shāh-ji-ki-Dheri near Peshawar (ASI, AR, 1908-9, pp. 29 ff) have brought to light an inscription mentioning Agis'ala as the overseer of works at Kanishka vihāra in the Samghārāma of Mahāsena.

2. ASI, AR, 192 1, p. 85.

3. Luders' List, No. 142 a.

4. One more inscription of Rajano Vas-Khushana, dated in the year 22 has been attributed to him (C. Krishnamacharlu, Proc. Ind. Hist. Congress., 7th, pp. 135-6). But obviously there can be no certainty.

years Vāśishka did not issue any coins, none of which have come to light upto this time.

Vāśishka is mentioned even in Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī. We read tn this work : "There were in this land three kings, Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who built three towns named after them. That king Jushka, who built Jushkapur with its vihāra, was also the founder of Jayasvāmipura. These kings, who were given to acts of piety, though descended from the Turushka race, built at Sushkaletra and other places maṭhas, chaityas and similar (structures). During the powerful reign of these (kings) the land of Kashmir was, to a grent extent, in the possession of Buddhas, who by (practising) the law of religious mendicancy had acquired great renown. At that time one hundred and fifty years had passed in this terrestrial world since the blessed Śākyasiṁha had obtained complete beautitude. And a Bodhisattva lived (then) in this country as the sole lord of the land, namely the glorious Nāgārjuna, who resided at Shadarhadurna."[1] Here inspite of discrepancy in the date and reversal of the order of the kings,[2] there is no doubt an echo of the fame of the celebrated Buddhist Kanishka who is known to be the contemporary of Nāgārjuna, and that of his successors Vāśishka and Huvishta.

HUVISHKA

The dates of Huvishka known from his some one dozen inscriptions found at Mathurā, with two exceptions one from Alika and the other from Wardhaka, range from 28 to 60, that is, 172 to 204 A. D. A Mathurā inscription,[3] referring to the

1. Raj., Stein's ed., I, verses 169 ff.

2. Some scholars think that Kanishka comes last in the list of the kings supplied by Kalhaṇa because he is Kanishka II coming after Vāśishka (H. C Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 1923, p 255. See also Konow, Corpus, II, i, p. LXXIX). But even on the supposition of Kanishka II in this way, the order of the kings in Kalhaṇa's list 'Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka' does not appear to be right. The order of the kings in this list seems to have gone reverse.

3. JRAS, 1924, p. 401.

restoration of a delapidated devakula duridg his reign represents him as the grandson of a king who had the appellation "sachadhramathita", i. e., 'steadfast or abiding in the true law,' which occurs on the coins of Kujūla Kaphsa.[1] Like Kanishka I Huvishka seems to be a patron of Buddhism as he built a splendid monastery at Mathurā.[2] He also resembled Kanishka in his taste for diversity of coin-types. Beside a medley of Greek, Persian and Indian deities, we have on one of his coins the remarkable figure of Rome.[3] All these coins are found extensively with the coins of Kanishka I.

VĀSUDEVA I

Huvishka seems to have been followed by Vāsudeva, the dates of whose inscriptions,[4] found only in the Mathurā region, range from the year 64 to 98, i.e., A. D. 208 to 242.

Now we learn from the Chinese sources[5] that the Ta Yue-chi Po-tiao sent an embassy to the Chinese emperor in the year 230, and received the title 'King of the Ta Yue-chi allied to the Wei'. The T'ang pronunciation of the name of this king was Pua-d'ieu,[6] which can very well be a rendering of Vāsudeva.

There is one more notice of this period of the Yue-chi rule in north-western India in the Chinese literature.[7] We learn from Yu-houan, the author of Wei-lio (A History of the Wei Dynasty, A.D. 220-264), which was composed between A.D. 239-265 and covers the period of the Wei down to the reign

1. The epithet is also applied to Amgoka in the Kharoshti documents (Burrow, p. 128). F. W. Thomas reads the inscription to mean that Huvishka was the name of the grandfather (JRAS, 1952, p. 110).

2. Cf. Luders' List. No. 62.

3. Camb. Short. Hist., p. 79.

4. For the newly discovered inscription of this year, see Indian Archaeology, 954 55, p. 27.

5. Chavannes, T'oung Pao, II, V, p. 850. Cf. Konow, Corpus, II, i, p. LXXVII.

6. Karlgren, Nos. 783, 1240.

7. Cf. Corpus, II, i, p. LV.

of the emperor Ming (227-239 A. D.), that the Yue-chi power was flourishing in Chi-pin (the Indo-Kābul region), Ta-hia (*Bactria*), Kao-fu (*India*) *as late as the second quarter of the* third century A. D.

We shall, however, see in the next chapter that at this time Ardashir Babagan (A. D. 226-241), the founder of the Sassanian kingdom, invaded the Kushāṇa empire. It was perhaps against this invader that Vāsudeva sought the help of the Chinese emperor about 230 A. D. through an embassy. But it was all in vain because the Sassanians seem to have conquered soon the entire territory lying to the north of the Hindukush. This fatal blow to the Kushāṇas must have encouraged the Yaudheyas, the Nāgas, the Maghas and several other peoples to assert their independence in the eastern parts of the Kushāṇa dominions. The empire thus began to shrink at both ends and the forces of disintegration began to gain ground within its limits.

The coins of Vāsudeva, mostly having only one type with the figure of the Śiva attended by Nāndī, are found over an extensive area with the issues of Kanishka and Huvishka.

KANISHKA II

An inscription found at Ārâ in Attock district in the Punjab is dated in the year 41 of Kanishka, son of Vājheshka, who bears the titles mahārāja, rājātirāja, devaputra and Kaisara.[1] The title Kaisara not only distinguishes this Kanishka from Kanishka I but it also puts him after Vāśishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva, none of whom uses it. The date 41 of this king collides with the reign-period of Huvishka who is known to have ruled the whole of Kushāna empire

1. For the discussions about this king see R. D. Banerjee, Ind Ant., XXXVII, 1908, pp. 58 ff; Luders, SBAW, 1912, p. 827 translated IA 1913 pp, 132 ff; Fleet, JRAS, 1913, pp. 95 ff; Konow, Corpus, II, i, pp. LXXX ff and Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 141 ff; Leeuw, SP, pp. 305 ff; Ghirshman, Begram and others.

from the year 28 to 60. So the date 41 appears to have left one hundred more than the years of the other kings of Kanishka I's group.[1]

Numismatic evidence also proves[2] the existence of a second Kanishka after Vāsudeva. The monogram on the coins of this ruler is that of Vāsudeva, and not of Kanishna I, and so he must have succeeded Vāsudeva and not preceded him. The Greek script on his coins is quite corrupt as compared to that on the issues of all other early rulers. His different coins bear occasionally different Brāhmī letters like vasu, viru, mahi, vi, si, bhri, chu, khu, vai, pa, ga, na, tha, etc. which are never found on the coins of earlier Kushāṇa emperors. These letters are sometimes said to be the initials of various governors, provinces, tribes and cities which began to appear on the coins of their respective areas to assert their growing freedom from the falling empire.

The coins of Kasishka II are numerous and so we can reasonably assume that he had a fairly long reign. They are found mostly in the Punjab, Seistan, and southern Afghanistan, which must, therefore, have been included in his kingdom. The other parts of the empire seem to have slipped out of his control.

These coins are of two types. The first is a continuation of the type of his predecessor, Vāsudeva, where we have Śiva *by the side of his* bull on the reverse. *In the second* type the Roman goddess, seated Ardoksho, takes the place of Śiva. The coins of the first type are usually found in

1. V. V. Mirashi (IE, XXVI, 1942, pp. 293-97) reads the year 10 of Kanishka to be really year 54. If this reading be correct, this inscription also will have to be attributed to Kanishka II. Lohuizen (SP, pp. 302 ff) thinks that hundred is omitted even in the Mathurā inscription of Kanishka dated 14 and the Sāñchi inscription of Vash Kushan dated 22.

2. A. S. Altekar (NHIP, VI; p. 13 ff), Cunningham (NC, 1893, pp. 93-123, 166-262 and 1894, pp. 242 293); Vincent Smith (IMC, I, 1906, pp. 67-88); R. D. Banerjee (JASB, 1908, pp 81-93); Whitehead (PMC, I, pp. 211-212); and Bachhofer (JAOS, Vol. 56, 1936, pp. 429-439) have distinguished these coins from those of Kanishka 1.

Afghanistan, and those of the second type in Gandhāra, Seistan and the Punjab.

VĀSUDEVA II

Some coins bearing the name of Vāsudeva or only Vāsu *have a different monogram from the common coins of* Vāsudeva I. They also show greater degeneration in Greek script. On them we occasionally find the letters rada, phri and ha which are interpretted by *some* scholars, like such monograms on the coins of Kanishka II, to be the initials of his self-asserting governors in different parts of his dwindling kingdom. Some numismatists[1] infer from these coins the existence of a second Vāsudeva. This king was probably the governor of Seistan under Kanishka II whose coins generally coming from that part bear the letters vāsu. The coins of this king are found in very small number mostly in the western Punjab and the Kābul valley.[2] *His rule might* have been confined only to this area. Seistan seems to have been wrested from this king or his immediate predecessor by the Sassanian king Varahran II (A. D. 276-293) as shown in the next chapter. The eastern Punjab appears to have gone to the native Indian rulers.

After Vāsudeva II we have no information of any other Kushāṇa ruler. Most probably after his death the vast Kushāṇa empire turned into a small subordinate kingdom in the Gandhāra *region or* disappeared altogether.

A few kings ruling in Chi-pin and Gandhāra claimed to belong to the family of Kanishka even centuries after the Kushāṇa *empire* had passed away.[3]

1. R. D. Banerji, JASB, 1908, p. 11 ff, Whitehead, Punjab Mus. Cat., I, pp. 211-12; and A. S. Altekar, NHIP. VI, p. 14 n.

2. R. D. Banerjee, JASB, 1909, p. 89.

3. See the itinerary of the eighth century Chinese pilgrim Oukong. Cal. Rev., 1822, pp. 193, 459; and Alberuni, Vol. II, p. 13.

5. INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF THE KUSHĀṆA EMPIRE

Among all the empires of ancient India, the Kushāna empire enjoyed a unique international position. Stretching from the Oxus valley to the Gangetic basin, it occupied a large part of the whole civilized world of the time situated in the middle of some other empires.

At this time the eastern-most parts of the known world were occupied by the 'Celestial' empire of China. In the second-first centuries B.C. this empire brought all the Chinese territories within its limits and in the north came into conflict with the Hūṇa empire. The Hūṇas were the well-known rivals of the Yue-chis. The Kushāṇas were a branch of this people. And so, in their war against the Hūṇas, the Chinese tried to enlist the support of the Yue-chi in their own favour through the celebrated envoy Chang-k'ien. Of course the envoy could not succeed in his mission. However, he must have ,opened the way for further communication and co-operation between the Yue-chi and the Chinese. In connection with their expansion towards the west, the Chinese appear to have come into direct contact with the Yue-chi. We hear of the great Chinese general Pan-chao subjugating Kashgar, Yarkand etc. which once lay under the Yue-chis. In their turn the Yue-chis also must have given blows to the Celestial empire. The Great Kushāṇa emperor Kanishka is said to have defeated the Chinese chiefs upto the Yellow River.

To the north ol China existed the empires of the Hūṇas and the Wusuns. At the time of their earliest appearance in history the Yue-chis lived with these peoples. As shown already, driven out of their homeland by these tribes, they had come to settle in India. So the Yue-chis had intimate knowledge of these peoples as also of the territories occupied

by them. This must have led them to social and commercial intercourse with these lands.

Under the Kushāṇas north-western India witnessed marvellous development of Northern Buddhism. By and by this religion spread all over the Kushāṇa, Chinese, Hūṇa and Wusun territories. Close relation of the Kushāṇas with these eastern peoples appears to have told much upon the oxpansion of this creed.

To the west of the Kushāṇa empire there existed the great Parthian empire. The Parthians were northern nomads like the Kushāṇas and Yue-chis and they appear to be closely connected with these people. At the very time when the Yue-chi came to the Oxus valley we begin to hear of their conflict with the Parthians and sometimes of rebel Parthian chiefs taking shelter under the Yue-chis. In the first half of the first century A. D. the Kushāṇas enter history with their king, Kujūla Kadphises who, after a series of conquests, annexed all Bactria, crossed the Hindukush, occupied the Kābul valley and extended the frontiers of his empire as far as the left bank of the Indus, seizing these countries from the last princes of the Parthian origin, probably the successors of Gondophernes. In his epxansion towards the west, he seems to have come into contact with the Parthians, and his coinage seems to indicate that he seized the district of Merv from them, probably fixing the common frontier on the border of Hyrcania.

"This expansion of the young Kushāṇa kingdom occurred at a time when the vigorous policy of Nero and his advisers was making itself felt as far as the eastern shore of the Caspian Sea. Rome entered into relations with Hyrcania, and the two countries even seem to have concluded a treaty. The economic motive in the agreement was paramount for the Romans, who were apparently anxious to safeguard a route along which trade could move between Rome, China, and

India without crossing (hostile) Parthian territory. The products of these oriental countries passed down the Oxus, crossed the Caspian Sea, were carried up the river Cyrus, and after a portage of five days embarked on the Phasis and so reached the Black Sea. In A. D. 58 Hyrcania became independent of the Parthian kingdom and sent an embassy to Rome. By his annexation of Merv and a probable alliance with the Hyrcanians, Kujūla Kadphises controlled practically the whole of the navigable course of the Oxus and reached the Caspian Gates. His successor Wima Kadphises continued the work of his father. In the West he profitted from the weakness of the Parthians and their wars with Rome to capture Herat, Seistan, and Arachosia. In the East, he seized all western India, and held the mouth of the Indus as well as the western ports of the Peninsula."[1]

From the time of Augustus and following the discovery of the mansoons intese meritime traffic sprang up between the Red Sea and India. Merchandise from Egypt and the eastern basin of the Roman Meditarranean was loaded in the Red Sea ports, arrived at the mouth of the Indus, went up the river as far as the modern Peshāwar, crossed the Hindukush and Pamirs in caravans, and, after traversing Chinese Turkistan, reached China. From the beginning of the second century, the Kushāṇas, therefore, controlled the three main stretches of the great 'Silk Road': first, the road of the two seas, the Caspian and Euxine ; secondly the road which passed through Merv, Hecatompylos, and Ecbatana, crossed the Euphrates and so reached the Mediterranean ports ; and thirdly, the maritime route between India and the Red Sea. The result was that north-west India, under the Kushāṇas, became the main centre of trade and commerce of the whole contemporary world leading to enormous increase of gold in the country as attested to

1. R. Ghirshman, Iran, Penguin Books Series, 1954, pp. 160-61.

by discovery of numerous Roman gold coins of this time in India and by gold currency of the Kushāṇas with its legends in Greek which was the lingua franca of the time. Apart from discovery of a large number of Roman gold coins in India, excavations at Erikamedu, Rājaghāta near Vārāṇasī and Baroda suggest the existence of several Roman trade centres, not only on the sea coast but also in the inner parts of the country as indicated by the works like Periplus.[1]

The formation of the Kushāṇa empire on their eastern confines was a double threat to the Parthians: politically, instead of having one enemy in the west, Iran became a central empire sandwiched between Rome and the Kushāṇas; economically, the Kushāṇas were, like the Parthians, middlemen in commerce and since they held stretches of the three trade routes, they could divert merchandise to roads that avoided Parthian territory. Rome was quick to catch the double significance of this new empire, and sought to enter into direct relations with its princes. The Kushāṇas, however, even under their great king Kanishka and his immediate successors, when their empire was at the height of their power, do not seem to have been attracted by the prospect of territorial gain at Parthian expense. The enormous wealth of India, which had not yet been unified under a single power, was much more inviting than the desert regions of eastern Iran, where the frontier between the two states seems to have been stabilized roughly on the line that to-day demarcates the frontier between Iran and Afghanistan. Nevertheless, the war of Kanishka against the Parthians

---

1. *For the detailed description of Roman trade in India see R. E. M. Wheeler, Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers, London, 1954;* H. G. Rawlinson, Intercourse of Ancient India with the Western World; E. G. Warmington, the Commerce Between the Roman Empire and India, Cambridge, 1928; M. D. Charlesworth, 'Roman Trade in India—A Resurvey', in Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in honour of A. C. Johnson, Princeton Univ. Press, 1951; Tarn, GBI; Ancient India, 1946, 'Excavations at Erikamedu,' p. 17 ff and 'Roman Coins in India'; Subbarao, Baroda Through the Ages; Krishna Deva, 'Excavations at Rājaghāta near Benares', Annual Bibli. of Ind. Hist. and Indology, III, (Bombay 1944).

mentioned in the Buddhist traditions could only have taken place during reign of Vologases III, and it may have been caused by a Parthian attempt to recover one of the Iranian provinces annexed by the Kushāṇas. A vague allusion in a Syrian text referring to the reign of Vologases IV (A. D. 191-207) speaks of a large army of 'Medes and Persians' who were said to have invaded eastern Iran. Vologases was encircled and at first suffered heavy losses, but his troops rallied and chased the enemy as far as 'the sea.' It, therefore, seems probable that relations between the neighbouring empire were not always peaceful. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the Parthians, who were exhausted by internecine wars and constantly in difficulties with Rome, tried to reduce the tension in the east to a minimum. Their decadence, however, coincides with the ascendancy of the Kushāṇa empire, which was a constant menace to Iran and threatened to weaken it still further by closing the trade route. The first Sassanians appear to be fully alive to this danger, and probably the conquest of the Kushāṇa empire was one of the earliest feats of arms of Shapur I. The Sassanians brought the Indus river under their control and exercised authority over the western parts of India probably bringing the Western Kshatrapas under their supremacy. Afterwards when they were entangled in wars with Rome and northern nomads, the Gupta emperors crushed the Western Kshatrapas and seized the ports on western coast, though they could not capture the Indus and the 'Silk route' inspite of their fight with the Sassanians for them as indicated by the Mehrauli Iron Piller inscription, if it really belongs to Chandragupta II of the Gupta dynasty.

CHAPTER IX

THE SASSANIANS

1. END OF THE KUSHĀṆA EMPIRE

The disappearance of the vast and mighty Kushāṇa empire is one of the most important events of ancient Indian history. There is, however, little information of the forces which worked behind it. Our historians have made much speculation on this point. But as yet no satisfactory solution has been reached.

The credit for the overthrow of the Kushāṇa power was once given to the Guptas.[1] But the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta makes it quite clear that the Kushāṇa rule in northern India had already come to an end when the Guptas were laying the foundations of their empire in this region.

Dr. K. P. Jayaswal advocated[2] the view that the Kushāṇa empire collapsed owing to the onslaughts of the Bhāraśivas whose work in this connection was later completed by the Vākāṭakas under the leadership of Pravaraena I. Dr. A. S. Altekar has, however, demolished this theory of Dr. Jayaswal conclusively.[3] He has shown that the Bhāraśivas and the Vākāṭakas had little contanct with the Kushāṇas.

Dr. Altekar himself has suggested[4] that the Kushāṇas were defeated and thrown beyond the Satlaj by the Yaudheyas in alliance with the Kunindas, Arjunāyanas and others. But there is hardly any tangible proof for this opinion. Dr. Altekar has based his theory merely on a seal of the Yaudhe-

1. R. D. Banerjee, The Age of Guptas, p. 5.
2. History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.
3. JNSI, V, pp. 111-124.
4. Ind. Cult., XII, 1945, pp. 119 123 and NHIP, VI, pp. 23 ff.

yas referring to them as the "holders of a mystic formula ensuring victory" (jaya-mantra-dhara) and on the figure of Kārtikeya and the Brāhmī legend "Yaudheyānām jayaḥ" on some Yaudheya coins said to be indicative of their victories. The fact of alliance of the Yaudheyas with the Kunindas, Arjunāyanas and other tribes has been inferred only from occurrence of the letters dvi, tri etc. on some Yaudheya coins. Apparently none of these conclusions are reliable. But even if it be accepted that the Yaudheyas were allied with some other peoples of their neighbourhood and that they secured several victories, it is a bit difficult to imagine that all this was directed surely against the Kushāṇas in view of complete absence of any evidence on this point. It is very likely that the Yaudheyas scored their victories against their neighbours like the Kunindas and the Arjunāyanas who appear ultimately to have merged into the Yaudheyas. The replacement of the Kushāṇa coinage by that of the Yaudheyas may denote only Yaudheya's coming after the Kushāṇas, and not necessarily victory of the former over the latter.

As a matter of fact there is good evidence to show that from the middle of the second century A. D. the Kushāṇa empire began to receive crushing blows from the Sassanians who had by this time founded a large empire all over Iran. The Sassanian invasion must have given a signal for independence to the eastern feudatories of the Kushāṇas. For a clear understanding of all this we have to examine in detail the history of the Sassanians.

2. THE SASSANIAN EMPIRE

The Parthians were northern nomads foreign to the Iranians. Their defeats at the hands of Romans and the Kushāṇas alienated them to the Iranian chiefs towards the end of the second century A. D. Now there was a revival

of the Iranian culture in the province of Fars, where the Persian tribes had first settled nearly one thousand years earlier. The empire passed to a line of national kings who, as descendants of the Achaemenians, claimed that they alone, and not the Arsacids, had the right to the throne. They founded a national state with a national religion and a civilization that was far more Iranian in character than that of the Parthians. They established a central power strong enough to curb the turbulent feudal aristocracy, built up a well-trained regular army and provided the country with an efficient administration. Thus strengthened, Iran successfully continued the policy of conquests and became so powerful that the civilized world appeared to be divided between it and Rome.

According to tradition, Sassan, the ancestor of the Sassanian dynasty, was a high dignitary in the temple of Anahita at Stakhr. His son Pāpak, who succeeded him in his office, married the daughter of a local prince from whom he seized power by a coup d'etat. He was followed by his son Ardashir who was the real founder of the Sassanian empire.

ARDASHIR I

Ardashir I (211-241 A. D.) reduced to submission all the small princes of Fars, succeeded in uniting the province under his rule and extended his suzerainty beyond its borders to Isfahan and Kerman. At this point the Parthian emperor, Artabanus V, became alarmed at his success and ordered the king of Ahwaz to march against him. But Ardashir defeated this force and shortly afterwards himself took the offensive. He routed the army of the Parthian king in three successive battles and in the final encounter in Susiana Artabanus himself was killed (A. D. 224). The way to the Parthian capital at Ctesiphon lay open and two years later Ardashir was crowned king.

The defeat and death of Artabanus did not remove all the obstacles that confronted Ardashir in his bid to become the undisputed master of Iran. A powerful coalition was formed against him for the purpose of restoring the Arsacids. The moving spirit was the king of Armenia, Chosroes I, himself a member of the Arsacid family. He opened the gates of the Caucasus in order to bring in Scythian aid and received support from Rome. The powerful king of the Kushāṇas, who was a scythian from Central Asia like the Arsacids and at whose court the members of the family of Artabanus had sought refuge, also placed forces at the disposal of the coalition.[1] Ardashir smashed the coalition in a series of battles, and by bribery persuaded some of the allies to abandon what was clearly a hopeless struggle. The Romans and the Scythians withdrew, and the Kushāṇa king retired after two years of hostilities. In the end the king of Armenia was left to continue the fight alone. He put up a stubborn resistance and was defeated only after ten years of fighting. Ardashir was now master of an empire extending from the Euphrates to Merv, Herat and Seistan.

There are indications to show that Ardashir extended his sway much towards the east at the cost of Vāsudeva I who was, according to our chronology, his contemporary Kushāṇa ruler. It is stated by Ṭabari[2] that after Ardashir's conquest of the countries bordering on Khorāsān, Merv, Balkh and Khwarizm, he returned to Fars and halted at Gor, where he was visited by messengers from the kings of Kushāṇa, Turān and Makrān who expressed their allegience. Ṭabari elsewhere records that the Kushāṇas were deprived of Bactria by Ardashir I[3]. Some more Byzantine and Oriental historians assert that the empire of Ardashir extended to the Indus and the Oxus, and upon their authority Gibbon[4]

1. R. Girshman, Iran, 1954, p. 291. , See also Lohuizen, SP, p. 319.
2. Noldeke, Tabari, pp. 17-18.
3. Tabari, Transl. by H. Zotenberg, tome II, 1869, p. 72.
4. Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. I, p. 349. See also D. J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins, 1924, p. 79.

observes that he obtained easy victories over the wild Scythians and effeminate Indians. A statement of Firishta[1] in his introduction is to the effect that Ardashir had invaded the Punjab advancing so far as the neighbourhood of Sirhind beyond the Satlaj, and he only then returned when the principal Indian monarch gave homage and paid tribute. On the basis of a coin[2] collected in Jhelum district (Punjab), Vincent Smith also gave the opinion[3] that Ardashir I had invaded the Punjab. Some scholars find reference to Ardashir's victory over the contemporary Kushāṇa emperor in the newly discovered trilingual Persipolis inscription of Shapur I.[4] This record is said to indicate that the Kushāṇa king had submitted to the Sassanian emperor.

SHAPUR I

Ardashir was succeeded by his son Shapur I (211—272 A.D.) who was equally successful against the Kushāṇas. In a long inscription sculptured on the walls of the fire-temple at Naqsh-i-Rustam,[5] he has recorded his first success : his victorious army seized Peshāwar, the capital of the Kushāṇa king; overran the Indus valley; and pushing north, crossed the Hindukush; conquered Bactria; passed over the Oxus; and entered Samarkand and Tashkent. The Kushāṇa dynasty, founded by the great Kanishka, is said to have been deposed and replaced by another line of princes who recognised the suzerainty of the Persians and ruled over a state considerably reduced in area. According to our chronology the reign of Vāsudeva I really comes to an end at about this time.

---

1. Elliot and Dawson, IV, p. 557.
2. See JASB, 1897, Pl. I, fig. VIII.
3. JRAS, 1920, pp. 221 ff. See also D. J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins, pp. 70-80
4. See JAOS, 1954, pp. 153 163.
5. See Ghirshman, Iran, 1954, p. 292. This scholar interprets also the newly found Persepolis inscription of Shapur I in this sense.

Honigmann and A. Maricq[1] interpret a term in the newly discovered Persipolis trilingual inscription of this king in such a way as to make Shapur 'the king of the Śakas' probably indicating a ruler not only over Seistan but also over the adjacent regions of Turān and Sind, all of which were known as the land of the Śakas (Sakastān or Scythia) at this time.

On the obverse of one of the few known copper coins of Shapur I there are traces of the inscription : "mazdesn bagī sahpuhrī kusān malkā." These coins fall among the 'Kushāno-Sassanian' issues, which were issued by the Sassanian prince-governors of Khorāsān imitating the Sassanian coinage on the obverse and the Kushāṇa one on the reverse. They bear the mint-monograms of Balkh, Merv and Samarkand, and are found in north-west Afghanistan,[2] the homeland of the Kushāṇas. It is just possible that from the time of his father, when he might have been the prince-governor of Khorāsān, Shapur held authority over some Kushāṇa chiefs whom his father had conquered.

We read in Ṭabari that in the year 252 A.D. Shapur I restored the situation in Khorāsān, and further that he nominated his son Hormizd governor of Khorāsān, and also that he made him his successor before he died. The silver drachm in the collection of the Institute des Langues Orientales at Petersburg, which belongs to one "Hormizd vuzurg Kushāṇa Śahanśāh", reproduces on the obverse the design and the legend of the Rawlinsons' aureus of Hormizd in the British Museum, and on the reverse the device of a drachm of Firoz with the king adoring Buddha. This

1. Honigmann et A. Maricq, Researches sus les Ros Gestal Divi Saporis, 1953. Cf, JAOS, 1954, pp. 183 85.

2. See E. Herzfeld, Kushāno-Sassanian Coins, MASI, No. 38, for all the coins referred to in this chapter. See also F.D.J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins, 1924; E. Herzfeld, Kushāno-Sassanian Coins, MASI, No. 89, 1930; St. Martin, JRASB, Num. Suppl., 1937; A. S. Altekar, NHIP, pp. 18 ff; Cunningham, Later Indo-Scythians and Num. Chron., especially 1893 94 and others.

coin seems to be the Kushāno-Sassanian issue of Hormizd who was the governor of Khorāsān. Here in the place of 'Kushāna-malkā' of Shapur I, Hormizd is called 'Kushān-Śahanśāh.' It is not unlikely that Shapur I conquered some more territories in Khorāsān at the cost of the Kushāṇas, and that, following the Sassanian convention, he made his successor the governor of this newly conquered region. We have to note in this connection that while Ardashir I calls himself only 'Śahanśāh-Eran' in his inscriptions on rocks and coins, Shapur I, followed by his successors, styles himself as 'Śahanśāh-i-Eran ut aneran' in his records.

HORMIZD I

Hormizd I (A. D. 272-3) reigned for only one year and ten days. Nevertheless he is said to have consolidated and extended the Sassanian rule in the east. An isolated notice that he waged war there is found in Maśūdi's works.

The Fihrist[1] mentions a Firoz, brother of Shapur I, as the prince-governor of Khorāsān under Shapur I and Hormizd I. On the obverse of a Kushāno-Sassanian drachm, most probably assignable to this ruler, the legend on the obverse reads: "Mazda-worshipping divinity Firoz, the great king of the Kushānas," while that on the reverse runs"...Pirozī malkā". This Firoz seems to be the Sassanian governor of the territories in western Afghanistan. F. D. J. Paruck reads[2] on two Kushāno-Sassanian coins of Firoz and on one coin of Hormizd I the legends: 'Malkā Indi' (King of Sind), 'Irdii' (Multan) and 'Hrezi' (Rājputānā)[3], and suggests that by the time of Hormizd I the Sassanian supremacy extended

1. Fluegel and Roediger, Kitābul-Fihrist, p. 419, no. 26. Cf. F. D. J. Paruck, Sassanian Coins, p. 61.

2. Revue Numismatique, 1937, pp. 71 ff and JNSI, I, 1939, pp. 59 71.

3. Dr. D. C. Sircar is of the opinion (JNSI, VII, 1946, pp. 135 ff) that it was the name of the Gurjara country nearabout Jodhpur, Bharatapur and Alwar.

upto Sind, Multan and some parts of Rājputānā. If the readings and interpretations of these legends were correct,[1] it is not impossible that the Sassanians had already spread their hold over some portion of the lower Indus basin. According to some scholars, as given above, Shapur I had conquered Sakastān including Sind. Hormizd I also seems to be active on his eastern frontier.

VARAHRAN I

Hormizd I was succeeded by Varahran I (273-276 A.D.). On the obverse of one of his drachm there is a legend, the concluding part of which reads: "Of spiritual origin from the sacred beings, the great Kushāna of the family of Ardashir." On another drachm of this king, F. D. J. Paruck has read 'Sktan' (Sakastān) and has found the figure of Varahran II. Paruck thinks that Varahran II, the Śakanśāh, conquered Sakastān while he was only a prince under Varahran I, and that by issuing this drachm-type with the legend Sakastān and figure of the conqueror, Varahran I commemorated his conquest.[2]

VARAHRAN II

Varahran I was followed by Varahran II (276-293 A.D.). Vopiscus, the Latin author of the life of emperor Carus, says that in the year 283 A. D. Varahran was occcupied by a 'domestic rebellion'. In 291 A. D. a Roman rhetor Mamertinus alludes to these events of the near past saying that the rebellion of his brother Ormies, i e., Hormizd, who was supported against the king by the Śakas, the Kushānas and the Gelans, caused Varahran II to make a disadvantageous

1 According to R. Born it is difficult to be certain about these readings and their interpretations (Annual Bibl. Ind. Archaeol., Kern Inst., Leyden, XI, 1936, p. 8). E. Herzfeld also gives different readings and interpretations of these legends.

2. Revue Numismatique, 1936, p. 71

peace with Rome. We learn from the Armenian Agathias, who used for his history a copy of the official documents in the royal archives, that he restored not only peace in the east, as Ibn Qutaiba states, but that he conquered the whole of Sakastān and took the title of Śakanśāh. From this time onwards the Kushāṇa country, the province of the prince-governors or heir-apparents, appears to have undergone in the direct management of the Sassanian emperors. The gold coinage of this area, formerly issued by the local prince-governors, began to be issued now in the name of the emperor himself bearing the mint-names of Merv, Balkh and Samarkand.[1] Prince-governor Varahran (III) now became Śakanśāh, not Kushānśāh. By this time the Sassanians appear to have conquered much of Sakastān to form a whole province and to have brought it under the control of their prince-governor.

Varahran II has been said to have conquered the whole of Sakastān without mention of its actual boundaries. It might have included the well-known province of Indo-Scythia on both sides of the lower Indus. We have seen already that after Vāsudeva I Seistan had come under the rule of Kanishka II. Varahran II might have seized it from this ruler. According to our chronology they ruled contemporaneously for some time.

NARSES I

Varahran II was succeeded by Varahran III who was expelled by his grand-uncle Narses (293-303 A. D.) only after four months. The Paikulī inscription[2] mentions the 'Avandikan xuat(a)uya' as siding with Varahran III, the Śakansāh, in this war of succession. Herzfeld identifies this ruler with the kshatrapa of Avanti. It seems that at this time the

1. See E. Herzfled, MASI, 38, pp. 34 ff.
2. For this inscription see E. Herzfeld, Paikuli, pp. 35-61.

Sassanian affairs influenced even the interior parts of India. This inference is corroborated by the same record through mention of some more Indian kings taking part in the coronation of Narses probably to show their allegiance to him. Among the independent kings we find the name of Kushanśāh, and among the vassals the names of Paradan (Paradas), Makuran (Makran), and the Ābhīras. Reference is then made to some twelve satrapas of all kinds such as Baqdat, the lord of Zuradian, and Mitr-(al)asen, the lord of Boraspian. Herzfeld takes them as Bhagadatta, the lord of Surāshṭra, and Mitrasena, the lord of Bhārukachchha.[1]

There are indications on the Indian side also for the Sassanian interference at this time in the affairs of the Western Kshatrapas and the Ābhīras who were ruling all over western India. During the reign of Narses I there was some disturbance in the Western Kshatrapa dynasty of Avanti, Surāshṭra and Kāthiāwār coming in power for more than one hundred and seventy five years. We find that the successor of Bhātridāman, who ruled upto 295 A. D., was not his son Viśvasena, who had functioned as a kshatrapa under him for some ten years, but one Rudrasiṁha II who is described as the son of Svāmi Jīvadāman, a person mentioned without royal titles like rājan or kshatrapa. Rudrasiṁha II as well as his successor Yashodāman II did never assume the higher title of mahākshatrapa. It may mean that on coming to the throne, Narses replaced the family which had worked against him in the struggle for succession by another family which accepted his subordination. Even some later disturbances in this dynasty may be due to the Sassanian interference.[2] The Ābhīras also seem to have acknowledged the Sassanian authority at this time.[3]

1. Contra. R. C. Majumdar, Classical Age, pp. 52-53.

2. See H. C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 5th ed., pp. 510-511. Contra. Dr. A. S. Altekar, NHIP, V, pp. 50 ff.

3. Rapson, BMCC, Andhra etc., p. cxxxiv.

HORMIZD II

Narses was followed by Hormizd II (303-310 A. D.). We learn from Ṭabari[1] as also from Mirkhond[2] that Hormizd married a Kushāṇa princess. The celebrated gold coins[3] of this king struck on the occasion of his marriage to the daughter of the great Kushāṇa of Kābul bear on the obverse the legends: "Mazda worshipping divinity Hormizd, the great king of the Kushāṇas". The same legend appears on the reverse also but with the addition of the word "royal" above the fire. The great Kushāṇa who married his daughter to Hormizd appears to be Vāsudeva II, who, after losing Seistan and Sind to Varahran II and the cis-Satlaj territories to the local Indian rulers, possessed only the Kābul region.

Some silver and copper coins of this king bear the legend "*Hormizd, the great king of the* Kushāns". *Some* of them sometimes show some signs of Indian influence. On the reverse *of one is seen the* Indian *deity* Śiva and *his* bull as on the coins of Kadphises, and on another is observed an Indian alter.

SHAPUR II

Hormizd II was succeeded early in 310 by his son Adarnarses, who was soon deposed and probably slain for his cruelty. The nobles thereafter crowned Shapur II (310-379 A.D.), new born or un-born at that time. Two Pahlavī inscriptions[4] found at Persepolis throw much light on the extent and nature of the Sassanian rule in India during his reign. The first of these was incised in the year (II ?) of Shapur II, i.e., probably 310-11 A.D. by Shapur Śakanśāh, the elder

---

1. *Noldeke, Tabari, p. 51, note 3.*

2. De Sacy, Mirkhond, p. 304.

3. F. D. J. Paruck attributes these coins to Hormizd I (JNSI, I, 1939. pp. 61-65).

4. See E. Herzfeld, M. A. S. I., 38, pp. 35-36.

brother of the infant king. Shapur Śakanśāh has the titles "Śahanśāh hinde śakastán u tuxaristān dabirān dabīr" ("the king of the Śakas, the minister of the ministers of Sind, Sakastān and Tukhāristān"). He is accompanied by the "Sakastān andarzpet" (the 'minister of public instruction of Sakastān'), by the "Zrang Satrap" ('the Satrap of Seistan') and some other dignitaries. The second inscription is written by Slok, i.e., Seleucus, the 'high judge of Kābul' in the year 47 (?) of Shapur II, who, according to this record, is paying his homage to Shapur Śakanśāh as his superior. It seems that Kābul also was wrested from the Kushāṇas by this time and annexed to the Śaka province of the Sassanian prince-governor. It was probably under the pressure of the Sassanians that the Kushāṇa "Devaputra Shāhi Shāhānushāhi' (probably a successor of Vāsudeva II) approached emperor Samudragupta of the Gupta dynasty with professions of allegiance as alluded to in his Allahabad Pillar inscription. After this we no more hear of any Kushāṇa emperor.

Thus it is clear that towards the end of the Kushāṇa empire in the middle of the third century A.D., the Sassanians began to exercise much pressure on the western Indian border-land. By and by they seized Afghanistan, Seistan, parts of the Punjab, Sind, and perhaps parts of Rājasthāna also from the Kushāṇas. At the time about the coronation of Narses I, they seem to dominate the whole of north-western India. But Narses I himself was singularly defeated by the Romans and constant engagements of other Sassanian monarchs also, who followed him, with the Romans and Scythians, appear to check them from further expansion in this direction, although lingering till the 7th-8th centuries A. D. to be conquered by the Mohammedan, they long maintained their dubious sway on north-western India, which ultimately passed under the Hūṇas.

3. THE KINGS OF THE PUNJAB

It appears that the Sassanian conquests in the east did not extend to the whole of the Punjab even. The conquest of this province is not explicitly claimed for any Sassanian ruler, nor does the coinage of the province of the 4th-5th centuries A. D. show any Sassanian influence. It is, however, difficult to state precisely who were the successors of Vāsudeva II in this land of the five rivers. There are no literary or epigraphic references on the point, and coins are our only source of information.[1]

THE SHĀKAS

The numismatic evidence shows that after the Kushāṇas the western and central Punjab was being governed by three Scythian houses. The western part of the province was ruled over by a dynasty which may be described as the Shāka (not Śaka) dynasty, as the term Shāka appears on the obverse of most of the coins issued by its rulers. Peshāwar might have been the capital of this house, where a large number of its coins have been discovered. The coins of the rulers of the Shāka families so closely resemble those of Kanishka II and Vāsudeva II that we may safely presume that they immediately succeeded Vāsudeva II in this area. Śyatha, Sita and Sena seem to be either the names or portions of the names of three rulers of this house.

THE SHILADAS AND THE GADAHARAS

The numismatic evidence indicates that the Shīladas and the Gaḍahāras were holding sway over the central Punjab at this time. Kings Bhadra, Bacharna and Pasana of the former dynasty, and Peraya and Kirada of the latter are known from coins. One after another these dynasties

1. For these coins see A. S. Altekar, NHIP, VI, pp. 19 ff. R. D. Banerji, JASB, 1908, pp. 89-91. V. A. Smith, IMCC, I, pp. 89-89; E. Thomas, Ind. Ant., XII, pp. 8 9, Cunningham, N. C., 1893, pp. 123 ff and Later Indo-Scythians and others.

appear to have ruled down to the days of Samudragupta for a Gaḍahara chief is seen putting the name of this emperor on his coins. The Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta mentions the Madrakas, who occupied the central Punjab nearabout Sialkot, as a republic or kingdom under the Gupta supremacy. It is very likely that the Gaḍaharas ruled over this state.

There is some evidence that the above rulers reigned in the western and central Punjab only in the first half of the fourth century A. D. In the later part of the century their rule was replaced by that of a new tribe of foreign invaders which is known as the Kidāra Kushāṇa.[1]

THE KIDĀRA KUSHĀṆAS

We are told by the Wei-shu or annals of the Wei Dynasty (A. D. 386-556) : "The kingdom of the Ta Yue-chi (the Great Kushāṇas) has for its capital the town of Lou-kien-chi (Balkh). They found themselves threatened on the north by the Juan-Juan, and were exposed on several occasions to their raids. They, therefore, migrated to the west and established themselves in the town of Po-lo (Balkan, on the north of the old bed of the Oxus where it flowed into the Caspian Sea, east of Krusnovosk). There king Ki-to-lo, a brave and warlike prince, raised an army; crossed to the south of the Great Mountains (Hindukush); and invaded northern India where the five kingdoms of the north of Kon-tho-lo (Gandhāra) submitted to him...

"Ki-to-lo, having been pursued by the Hiung-nu and having retired to the west, ordered his son to establish himself in the town of Fu-leu-cha (Peshāwar). These people are consequently called Little Yue-chi (Little Kushāṇas)."

1. M. F. C. Martin has brought together most of the evidences, both Chinese and numismatic, bearing on these people in JRASBL, III, Num. Suppl., XLVII, pp 23-60. See also A. S. Altekar, NHIP, VI, pp. 21 ff; and R. C. Majumdar, The Classical Age, pp. 55 ff.

Ma-twan-lin's encyclopaedic work also contains a brief account of the same event as follows : "The capital of the Little Yue-chi is the town of Fu-lie-cha. Their king was a son of Ki-to-loi. He was placed in charge of this town by his father when this prince was forced by the attacks of the Juan-Juan to march westwards"

KIDĀRA

A large number of coins[1] with the Brāhmī legend 'Kidāra Kushāṇa' have been found all over north-western India. The ruler of these coins has been identified by most of the scholars with the chief Ki-to-lo of the Chinese annals.[2] Formerly it was thought that Ki-to-lo or Kidāra was an Ephthalite and as such he should be placed about 325 A. D. when the Ephthalites first appear as invaders of the Sassanian dominions.[3] But it appears that the Kidāra Kushāṇas were distinct from the Ephthalites. On the basis of close resemblance of these coins with the issues of some Sassanian kings, Kidāra is now dated about the middle of the fourth century A. D.[4]

We learn from Ammian,[5] an officer in the Roman army who fought against Shapur II in Mesopotamia, that this Sassanid king was engaged from A. D. 350 to 358 in fighting against certain tribes on his eastern frontier. The most important among these tribes were the Chionites, who had invaded Bactria, and the Euseni, which has been recognised

---

1. For the coins of the Kidāras see Cunningham, Later Indo-Scythians, originally published as a series of essays in N. C., 1893 94; V. A. Smith, IMCC, pp. 90 ff and JASB, LXIII, 1894, pp 177 ff, R. D. Banerji, JASB, 1908, pp. 91-93, Martin, op. cit.; A. S. Altekar, NHIP, VI, pp. 21 ff and others.

2. V. A. Smith was opposed to this identification and believed that the well-executed Kidāra Kushāṇa coins were as early as A. D. 200 or 350 and approximately contemporaneous with the Shāka, Shilada and Gadahara coins referred to above (JASB, LXIII, 182-8).

3. Cunn., N. C., 1893, p. 184 and the *Later Indo-Scythians*, p. 185. See also Rapson, Indian Coins, p. 19.

4. Martin, op. cit., pp. 30 ff.

5. Martin, *ibid.*; and Herzfeld, Kushāno-Sassanian Coins, p 35.

as a textual corruption for Guseni or Kushāṇa, that is, the Kidāra Kushāṇa. In A.D. 358 Shapur made peace with these tribes and began his war of revenge upon Rome. The army with which he besieged the Roman fortress of Amida in Mesopotamia included contingents from his new allies, the Chionites and Kushāṇas. Both probably acknowledged supremacy of the Sassanian king and sent contingents to help their overlord in his wars against Rome. But later Kidāra seems to have asserted his independence. It appears from an account[1] of the Armenian historian Faustos of Byzantium that the Kushāṇas inflicted two crushing defeats on the Sassanians in A. D. 367-68, and on one occasion even forced Shapur II to fly from the battlefield.

M. F. C. Martin has adduced some numismatic evidence to corroborate the view that Kidāra, with his capital at Peshāwar, had accepted suzerainty of the Sassanians, who were then supreme in the whole of Indo-Kābul valley, in the beginning, and that afterwards he became an independent ruler. On the early coins of Kidāra his bust is seen facing right which, according to Martin, was a convention which had to be followed by all the feudatories of the Sassanian empire. In course of time, however, Kidāra felt himself strong enough to assume independence, and began to issue coins with the bust facing to the front, which was the privilege of the Sassanian emperor only.

According to the Chinese annals Kidāra was originally a king of Balkh coming of the great Yue-chi stock. His ancestors seem to be the kinsmen of the Indian Kushāṇas who remained in the Oxus valley. Later on the expansion of Juan-Juans or the Hiung-nus,[2] who established a vast

1. Martin, p 32.

2. The name of the tribe against which Kidāra was forced to march is given as Juan Juan by Ma-twan lin and Hiung nu by Wei-shu. After a deep study of this subject R. Ghirshman has reached the conclusion that Juan-Juan and Hiung-nu were the same and that they are the Avars of the western writers (Les Chionites-Hephthalites, 1918, p. 117). According to this scholar Juan Juan or Hiung-nu are different from Huns who are Hunas of India.

empire throughout central Asia under the name Avar, forced Kidāra to march westwards and carve out a kingdom round-about Peshāwar. The Yue-chi king is said to have left his son in-charge of his new kingdom, probably to be regent during his absence. It is possible that he had to carry on a prolonged campaign against the Juan-Juans or the Sassanians or both. Ultimately he seems to have been successful in maintaining his own against his enemies. In the Chinese annals 'the five kingdoms' (?) to the north of Gandhāra are said to have come under his rule. The coins bear testimony to the consolidation of his power in Gandhāra, Kashmir and Punjab. On some of his coins we find such names as Varoshahi, Piroch, Bhāsa and Budhabala. Generally these are thought to be the names of his governors, whom he might have appointed to rule over different parts of his large kingdom.[1]

PIRO AND VARAHRAN

On the basis of similarity of coins, Kidāra is said to have been followed by Piro and Varahran. Some coins of Piro and Varahran have the bust facing to right instead of facing to front. It is said to be indicative of the fact that during their reign the contemporary Sassanian emperors asserted their authority over the Kidāras.[2]

The continuance of the ruling dynasty founded by Kidāra even after Piro and Varahran is attested to by some more coins found in north-western India. These coins not only bear the names of the rulers who issued them, but have also the name Kidāra or its abbreviated form 'Kid' written vertically under the arms of the royal figure dressed like a Kushāṇa king. The gold coins of these little Kushāṇa rulers have been found over extensive areas between the rivers Rāvī and Ganges, most of which might have been ruled over

1. Martin, op. cit., pp. 33 ff, 41 ff, Altekar, op. cit., p. 22; and R. C. Majumdar, op. cit., p. 57.

2. Martin, op. cit, pp. 34-35 and 37-38.

by these kings at one time or the other. Among the names of individual rulers may be noted Kritavírya, Sarvayâśa, Bhāsvan, Prakāśa, Kuśala, Salonavīrya and Satomalla.[1] These coins seem to have been current for several centuries after which they merged into the series struk in Kashmir by the Kārkoṭaka or Nāga dynasty in the seventh century A.D.[2] The long currency of the coinage as well as its find-spots indicates that it was probably used by several dynasties. But it is impossible, with the meagre information available now, to arrange these kings in different dynasties and to locate them either chronologically or geographically. These dysns-ties were, no doubt, swept away when the Hūṇa avalanche broke in this region in the 5th century A. D. in its full fury. The name of the Kidāra famiiy, however, survived for a much longer time. Abu Rihān, the Mohammedan historian, calls the Turki prince who was supplanted about A.D. 900 by his Brâhmaṇa minister, "The last of the Katorman kings". The chief of Chitral still styles himself as Shah Kotar.

4. THE REPUBLICS OF CENTRAL INDIA

The crushing Sassanian blows on the Kushāṇas in their western homelands appear to have resulted in emergence of several small states all over western and central India. Their founders are likely to be foreign Kushāṇa governors who now asserted their independence.

THE YAUDHEYAS[3]

The Yaudheyas formed one of the most important states of this region. Their coins imitating Kushāṇa issues and sometimes bearing the legend and representations of god Skanda have been found in large numbers between the Satlaj and the Yamunā. The Bijayagarh inscription of about the third century A. D. speaks of a mahārāja-mahâsenāpati who

1. For a coin of this king see JNSI, 1953, pp. 79 ff.
2. Martin, p. 29, See also Cunn., N. C., 1893, pp. 187 ff, and Rapson, Ind. Coins, p. 19.
3. For a detailed discussion of the Yaudheyas and Mālavas see Allan, BMCC, Ancient India.

was placed at the head of the Yaudheya republic (Yaudheya-gaṇa-puraskrita). A large Yaudheya clay seal of about the fourth century A. D. from Ludhiyānā bears the representation of a bull and the legend "Yaudheyānāṃ jaya-mantra-dharāṇāṃ" ("The seal of the Yaudheyas who were possessor of a victory-charm"). In the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta, the Yaudheya people are mentioned as a subordinate ally of the Gupta Emperor. References to the Yaudheyas are found in several works of ancient Indian literature such as the Mahābhāshya, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and the Brihatsaṁhitā.

THE MĀLAVAS

The land on the southern side of the Yaudheyas came to be occupied by the Mālavas. The post-Kushāṇa coins of this tribe have been found in Ajmer-Tonk-Mewar area. While some of them bear the legend "jayo mālavānāṃ" or "mālavānāṃ jayaḥ", others have short legends such as Bhapamyana, Majupa, Mapojaya, Mapayu, Magajasa, Magojava, Mapaka, Yama, Pachha, Jamapaya, Jamaku etc. Most probably these are the names of Mālava chiefs of foreign extraction.

Also some inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries A. D. discovered in the Bharatpur, Kotah and Udaipur states belong to the Mālavas. One of them found at Nāndsā (Udaipur state) and dated in 226 A. D. refers to a Mālava chief named Śri (?) Soma who performed the Ekashashṭhi sacrifice. It is probable that the Maukhari mahāsenāpati Bala, known from the Badva inscriptions of A. D. 238, owed allegiance to the Mālava republic. All the above records are dated in the Krita era which later on came to be known as the Mālava era and still afterwards as the Vikrama era.

OTHER REPUBLICS

With the Yaudheyas and the Mālavas, the Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta mentions some other republics

of western and central India namely, Arjunāyanas, Madrakas, Ābhīras, Prārjunas, Sanakānikas, Kākas, and Kharaparikas. Some of these are known even from coins, inscriptions and allusions in ancient Indian literature. Later on while the last of them situated in central India might have fallen in the Gupta empire, the others situated in the Punjab and Rājasthān might have continued their semi-independant existense down to the middle of the 5th century A.D., when they appear to have been engulfed in the Hūṇa avalanche.

5. THE RULERS OF THE GANGETIC BASIN

The end of the Kushāṇa empire witnessed the rise of several small kingdoms in the Gangetic basin also. Some of them might have been founded by the Hinduized Kushānas of foreign origin.

THE NĀGAS

Large parts of Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh were occupied by kings of several Nāga families. The Purāṇas mention Nāga dynasties of several kings ruling at Vidiśā, Mathurā, Padmāvatī and Kāntipurī. The Harshacharita also refers to king Nāgasena of Padmāvatī. A Lahore Copper seal of about the fourth century A. D. refers to prince Maheśvaranāga, son of Mahārāja Nāgabhatta. The Vākāṭaka records mention Mahārāja Bhavanāga as the maternal grandfather of the Vākāṭaka emperor Rudrasena who ruled in the middle of the fourth century A. D. Bhavanāga is described as belonging to the family of the Bhāraśivas who had performed no less than ten As'vamedha sacrifices and had obtained by their valour the water of the Ganges. He is most probably identical with king Bhavanāga whose coins have been found at Padam Pawāyā, the ancient Padmāvatī, near Narwar in old Gwalior state.

1. JNSI, V, pp. 21 ff

Coins of some ten Nāga rulers have been found at Padam Pawāyā : Bhīmanāga, Vibhunāga, Prabhākaranāga, Skandanāga, Brihaspatināga, Vyāghranāga, Vasunāga, Devanāga, Gaṇapatināga and Bhavanāga. Some of these coins have been found also at Mathurā which is only about 125 miles from Padam Pawāyā. So some of these kings might have ruled at Mathurā. Gaṇapatināga is mentioned also in the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta.

After the Kushāṇa rule a king named Achyuta had risen to power in Ahichhatra (Rāmanagar in the Bareilly district, U. P.) where his coins have been found. He is also mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar inscription. His coin-type bears a close resemblance to that of some Nāga coins, and it is not improbable that he was himself a Nāga ruler.

Besides the above rulers, a king named Vīrasena is known to have flourished after the Kushāṇas. His coins have been found at Mathurā and also in Bulandashahr, Etah, and Farrukhabad districts. A few specimens have come from the Punjab. An inscription of this king has been discovered at Jankhat in the Farrukhabad district. Mattila, known from a seal found in Bulandshahr district, may be his successor.

THE MAGHAS[1]

Some inscriptions and coins reveal the existence of certain kings who ruled in Fatehpur, Allahabad and Rewa districts. As the names of some of them end in magha, they are known as Maghas. Rightly or wrongly they have been identified with the Megha kings of South Kośala mentioned in the Purāṇas.

1. For the detailed discussions about the Maghas see EI, XVIII, pp. 159 ff; XXIII, pp. 245 ff; XXIV, pp 146 ff and 253 ff, Jha Comm. Vol., pp 100 ff, IC, I, pp 692 ff; III, pp 179 ff, JNSI, II, pp. 417 ff; IX, pp. 4 ff and 133 ff; ASR, 1911-12, pp. 60 ff; NHIP, VI, pp. 41 ff, Age of Imp. Unity, pp. 175 ff etc.

The earliest ruler of this dynasty known from epigraphic sources seems to be Raja Vaśishthīputra Bhimasena of a Bhita seal In the Bandhogarh (Rewa district) inscription of the year 51 (A D 195 according to our system of chronology explained in the appendix) and the Ginja (40 miles to the south of Allahabad) inscription of the year 52 (196 A. D) Bhimasena is credited with the more dignified title of maharaja Maharaja Kautsīputra Praushthaśri, the son of Bhimasena, is known from six records found at Bandhogarh with dates in the years 86, 87 and 88 He is also known from his coins He was probably succeeded by Bhadradeva of a Bandhogarh inscription of the year 90, who is probably identical with Bhadadeva of another record of the same place It seems that while Praushṭhaśri and Bhadradeva were ruling in Rewa, Maharaja Kautsiputra Bhadramagha was ruling in Allahabad He is known from coins and inscriptions found at Kosam, the latter being dated in the years 81, 86 and 87

Two records from Bandhogarh mention Raja Vaiśravana, son of the mahasenapati Bhadrabala, who is known also from coins A Kosam inscription of the year 107 (A D 251) refers to him as a mahārāja A later king was mahārāja Bhīmavarman known from coins and two Kosam inscriptions dated 130 and 139 King Śivamagha of coins is, no doubt, identical with Maharaja Gautamīputra Śivamagha mentioned in a Bhīṭā seal and several inscriptions from Kosam Vijayamagha is known only from his coins found at Kaus'ambi, while Maharaja Gautamiputra Vindhyavedhana and Maharaja Śankarasimha are known only from their seals discovered at Bhīṭa

6 THE GUPTA EMPIRE

The above mentioned local kings of the Gangetic Basin ruled for some one hundred years As known from the Allahabad Pillar inscription, by the middle of the fourth

CHAPTER X

THE HUNAS

In the fifth sixth centuries A D India was invaded by a foreign people whose name has been given as Huna in the Indian literature and inscriptions At several places in the ancient Indian works they have been mentioned as coming from the north with other foreign peoples like the Yavanas, the Śakas, and the Kushanas

1 THE CHINESE SOURCES

Some old Chinese texts throw a little more light on the origin of the Hunas We learn from them that among the barbarians who lived in Mongolia to the north of China and invaded the Celestial Empire from time to time, were a group called the Rung, another called the Di, and a third group which is sometimes called Hun yu and sometimes Hien yun These peoples had been in occupation of the region from about 2 000 B C which is the earliest time known to the Chinese literature They are said to be Turanian in race and speech rather than Chinese or Mongol The name Hun yu or Hien yun is thought by some scholars to be the native name of that group of peoples who are known as Huns in the west [1]

Towards the close of the third century B C practically all of the various tribes inhabiting Mongolia were absorbed in a newly established confederation headed by a tribe known as Hiung nu According to W M McGovern [2] it is now

1 For the various names applied to these people see Shiki 110 pp 1 ff. Cf. W M. McGovern The Early Empires of Central Asia 1939 p 69

2. Ibid., p 102.

universally accepted that the Hiung-nu were, in part at least, the ancestors of the people known to the westerners under the name of Huns.

Nearabout the fourth century A. D., a Hunnish people, named Juan-Juan by the Chinese, probably the same who are known as the Avars to the European chroniclers, established a big empire embracing almost the whole of central Asia. Their king Touloun Shan-yu or Khaqan conquered the Hiung-nu living in their native country situated to the north of the Chinese Wall. Now the Hiung-nu pushed themselves eastwards probably splitting into three branches : (1) The Huns of Attila who came in conflict with the Romans; (2) The Kidārite Huns who conquered the Caucasus; and (3) The Hephthalites or the White Huns who settled in Tukhāristān defeating and killing the Sassanian king Firoz in 484 A.D.

W. M. McGovern[1] is of the opinion that though greatly mixed with the ancestors of the Huns of Europe in origin, the Ephthalites who entered into Persia and India are in fact different from them. He shows that according to the Chinese literature the real name of the Ephthalites or the White Huns, as they are called by the Graeco-Roman writers, was Hua, and that they came to be designated as Ye-ti-i-li-do because of the fact that one of the great Hun rulers bore this name. According to one Chinese chronicle the Ephthalites were ultimately of the same origin as the Yue-chi, but according to another they were a branch of the people who inhabited Kucha or Turfan. According to the latter version the Ephthalites were descended from a group of Turfanese who in A. D. 126 had aided the Chinese general Bau Yung in his attacks upon the northern Huns,

1. ECCA, pp. 405 ff.

and who afterwards had settled in Zungaria. It seems that towards the beginning of the fifth century A. D. the Ephthalites left Zungaria under the pressure of the Avars and established their empire all over Kashgaria, Sogdia, Bactria and Gandhāra. According to this scholar Toramāṇa, the Great Hūṇa ruler of India, was born in the Ephthalite family of the tegin ruling over Gandhāra.

R. Ghirshman has made a special study of the Heptha-lite records.[1] He has come to the conclusion that by the middle of the fifth century A. D. the Hindukush region came to be occupied by some Hunnish tribes. The northern part of these people became known as Hephthalite, Ephthalite or Ye-tha after the name of the dynasty ruling there, while the southern was called Chionites. In the opinion of this scholar the Hephthalites later on spread over Iran, while the Chionites advanced towards India as the mercenaries of the Kidār Kushāṇas whom they afterwards overpowered and founded their own kingdom.

Ghirshman shows that the Chionites were a Hunnish people speaking an Iranian language. They are called Hūna in different languages with little variations. In India also they are known as Hūṇa. In addition to calling them Hiun (not Hiung-nu), the Chinese historians mention them also as a part of Yue-chi. They were probably a mixture of the Hiung-nu (including Hun-yu or Hien-yun) and the Yue-chi, created in north-east China at the earliest time of their appearance in history or somewhere in the south-west in the course of their migration in the later times. In the very beginning they might have got also some Kucha blood of the Turfanese tribes speaking Iranian language.[2]

1. Les Chionites Hephthalites, 1948.

2. Some other scholars like Aurel Stein (IA, XXXIV. 1905, pp. 83 84), Fleet (IA. XV, 245), K. Jayaswal (JBORS, XVIII, 203) and R. C. Majumdar (NHIP, VI, p. 182) have said that Toramāṇa and Mihirakula, the leaders

Sir John Marshall[1] found some skulls at Takshaśilā. From some circumstances of the discovery, these skulls are said to be those of the Indian Hūṇas. An examination of these skulls shows that they belong to the Turfanese of Kashgaria rathet than to the European Huns.

2. THE HUṆAS AND SKANDAGUPTA

Unfortunately we have no definite information about the details of the Hūṇa conquest of India. It is, however, very probable that by the middle of the fifth century A. D. *they had overrun the whole of Indus basin.*[2] King Skandagupta (455-c. 467 A. D.) of the Gupta dynasty claims a decisive victory over the Hūṇas in a fierce battle which is quite likely to have taken place near Surāshṭra-Kāthiāwār in the very beginning of his reign. The Bhitarī Pilar inscription of this monarch refers to this battle with the Hūṇas in which the whole earth is said to have moved on account of very heavy blows inflicted by the arms of the king. Another record of the *same king set up at Junāgarh in Surāshṭra in the very* first year of his reign not only refers to his brilliant success in an equally ferocious battle with the 'Mlechchhas', who were most probably the Hūṇas, but also to his anxiety to appoint an able governor over Surāshṭra-Kāthiāwār who might be capable *of "protecting"* it *(against the Hūnas ?).*

3. SUNG-YUN'S ACCOUNT

After the defeat inflicted upon the Hūṇas by Skanda-

---

of the Indian Huṇas were Kushāṇa rather than Huṇs. However, see Sten Konow (IHQ. XII, 532) against this view for support of the general opinion that these Indian Huṇa leaders were Huns in origin

1. Taxila, II, pp. 69-70.

2. Fa hien (The Travels of Fa-hsien, 399-414 A. D., H. A. Giles, pp. 14, 74) has, no doubt, referred to an Ephthalite invasion of Gandhāra before his visit to this country (c.400 A.D.) R. C. Majumdar, however, points out that the real word in the pilgrim's record is Yue-chi, not Ephthalite (The Classical Age, p. 53, fn. 1).

gupta the earliest information regarding their relation with India is supplied by the account of Sung-yun, the Chinese pilgrim sent in A. D. 518 by the empress of the Northern Wei dynasty to the western countries in search of religious books. Passing through Udyān, the pilgrim reached Gandhāra in 520 A. D. and gave the following description[1] of this country: "This is the country which the Yethas destroyed and afterwards set up Lae-lih to be king[2] over the country; since which event two generations have passed. The disposition of this king (or dynasty) was cruel and vindictive and he practised the most barbarous atrocities. He did not believe in the Law of Buddha but loved to worship demons. The people of the country belong entirely to the Brāhmaṇa caste; they had a great respect for the Law of Buddha and loved to read the sacred books when suddenly this king came into power who was strongly opposed to any thing of the sort. Entirely self-reliant on his own strength, he had entered on a war with the country of Kipin (Cophene) disputing the boundaries of their kingdom and his troops had been already engaged in it for three years.

"The king has 700 war-elephants, each of which carried ten men armed with sword and spear, while the elephants are armed with swords attached to their trunks, with which to fight at close quarters. The king continually abode with his troops on the frontier and never returned to his kingdom in consequence of which the old men had to labour and the common people were oppressed".

Further we are told that "Sung-yun repaired to the royal camp to deliver his credentials. The king was very rough with him and failed to salute him. He sat still whilst

1. Beal, Records, I, pp. XCIX-CII.

2. According to Beal (Records, I, fn. 50) "or set up a large dynasty, but the whole of the context is obscure." J. Marquart (Erānšahr, p. 211) thinks this word to be Tegin which was a title given to the Ephthalite princes.

receiving the letters...(On being asked about his difficulties on the way, irate) Sung-yun replied. '...Your majesty and your forces (three armies), as you sojourn here on the frontier of your kingdom enduring all the changes of heat and cold, are not you also nearly worn out? ...The sovereign of the Ye-tha and also of Uchang, when they received our credentials, did so respectfully, but your majesty alone has paid us no respect..."

From this account it is clear that the Ye-tha or Ehthalites had appointed a governor to rule over Gandhāra in the second half of the fifth century A. D., and that they had attacked and destroyed that country still earlier about 450 A. D. when they are seen coming down upon the Sassanians. The account of the Chinese pilgrim is couched in so vague a language that it is difficult to infer any thing more from it with perfect certainty. This too is not clear whether the king, who was ruling over Gandhāra at the time of Sung-yun's visit (520 A.D.) was of the family appointed by the Ye-tha to rule over Gandhāra or not. The Chinese pilgrim clearly distinguishes him from the Ye-tha emperor and refers to him as an independent king of Gandhāra. Some historians are inclined to identify this king with Mihirakula. There is, however, no definite evidence for this identification. The king of Gandhāra of Sung-yun's time, no doubt, must be a close contemporary of Mihirakula. But Gandhāra might be independent of Mihirakula's hold. It might have been ruled over by the king who was as rough and war-like as Mihirakula himself.

4. TORAMĀṆA

The earliest Hūṇa ruler definitely known to have penetrated into the interiors of India is Toramāṇa. An inscription referring to him as 'rājādhirāj mahārāja toramāṇa shāhi jau(bla)' has been found at Kura in Salt Range in the

Punjab.[1] A seal impression of his has been discovered at the site of the Ghoshitārāma monastery at Kauśāmbī.[2] Another inscription engraved by a feudatory named Dhānyavishṇu at Eraṇ in the Saugor district of Madhya Pradesh state is dated in the first year of Mahārājādhirāja Toramāṇa. The same place has yielded one more inscription commemorating the erection of a dhvaja-stambha or flag-staff in honour of Janārdana by Mahārāja Mātrivishṇu, ruler of the Airikinia vishaya, and his brother Dhānyavishṇu while the Bhupati (king) Budhagupta was reigning and Mahārāja Suraśmichandra was governing the land between the Kālindī (Yamunā) and the Narmadā in the year 164, that is, A. D. 484-85. It shows that Toramāṇa conquered Eraṇ region from Budhagupta or one of his successors sometime after 484 A. D. within a single generation as indicated by mention of Dhānyavishṇu in the record of Budhagupta as well as that of Toramāṇa. One more epigraph from Eraṇ, dated in the year 510-511, commemorates the death of the illustrious general Goparāja in a "very famous battle fighting on the side of glorious Bhānugupta, the bravest man on the earth, a mighty king, equal to Pártha" against some enemy whose name has not been given. Probably here we have a reference to the war between the Guptas and Toramāṇa resulting in transference of the territories near about Eraṇ from the former to the latter.

The extent of coinage also corroborates the extension of Hūṇa dominion known from the inscriptions. The Hūṇa coins of the thin Sassanian fabric are naturally the earliest in date. Of these the class which bears inscriptians in the

1. Bubler (EI, I, 239) differentiated this ruler from king Toramāṇa known from other sources simply because the titles Shāhi and Jauvla are found nowhere else. But all other historians have accepted the identification of these rulers. But D. B. Disalkar (JNSI, VIII, 1946, pp. 63 ff) also thinks that there were two Toramāṇas and two Mihirakulas.

2. A coin-mould bearing the inscription 'Huṇarāja' alone, found at the same place, probably refers to this very ruler (Indian Archaeology, 1954-55, p. 18).

same modified form as the Greek alphabet found on the Kushāno-Sassanian coins is, no doubt, older than the class which has Nāgarī inscriptions and was evidently issued before the Hūṇa invasion of inner India. Many specimens of this type seem to be merely Sassanian pieces with the head of the Hūṇa leader restruck in repousse with the legend 'shāhi javuvlah'[1] so that the reverse-type, the Sassanian fire-alter, is almost obliterated. The class of coins, thus produced, was, no doubt, the prototype from which the later coins struck in the ordinary manner were copied.

Other specimens of Hūṇa coinage are copies of the current Sassanian coins and in particular of those issued during the later part of the reign of Sassanian emperor Firoz, that is, 471-486 A. D. The first imitations, which most resemble their prototypes, have been found in great numbers in Marwār, and testify to the Hūṇa conquest of the lower Indus country and western Rājasthāna. The issuer of these coins might have been the Hūṇa invader of Gupta empire in the time of Skandagupta, although he has been identified by Hoernle with Toramāṇa.

We have silver as well as copper coins of Toramāna inscribed with his name found mostly in the eastern Punjab

and Rājasthāna. They copy the Sassānian as also the Gupta coin-types. Some silver hemidrachmae of these, which are minutely imitated from those of Budhagupta, certainly afford evidence of Toramāṇa's conquest of eastern Mālavā at the cost of Budhagupta or his successor. These coins are probably dated in the year 52.

Toramāṇa seems to have left his powerful impress even on the Indian literature. We find an interesting account of his in a Jaina work, Kuvalayamālā, composed in 700 Śaka, that is, 778 A. D. Toramāṇa (written as Torarāya in one manuscript), we are told, enjoyed the sovereignty of the world or rather of Uttarāpatha. He lived at Pavaiya on the banks of Chandrabhāgā (Chenāb river). His Guru was Hrigupta who himself was a scion of the Gupta family and lived there. He is also referred to in the Rājataraṅgiṇi[1] though, perhaps by mistake, as a descendant of Mihirakula. It is said in this work that he was put in prison by his elder brother who was the king for attempting to occupy kingship for himself. Again, the Jain author Somadeva (10th century A. D.) refers to the tradition that a Hūṇa king conquered Chitrakūṭa.[2] In view of Eraṇ inscription and Kauśāmbī seal of Toramāṇa we can say that reference here is probably to this king. Some scholars find reference to Toramāṇa even in the Ārya-Manjurśrī-Mūlakalpa and on its basis make Toramāṇa conquer India upto Magadha and Gauḍa, and die at Vārāṇasī.[3]

5. MIHIRAKULA

Toramāṇa was most probably succeeded by Mihirakula whose known inscription from Gwalior dated in the year 15 mentions the name of his father whose only first two letters 'tora' can be read, the rest being utterly lost. This name

1. Rāj, Stein ed., Vol, I, Chapt. 3, pp. 102-104.

2. Bhand. Comm. Vol., p. 216.

3. K. P. Jayaswal, Imp. Hist. Ind, pp. 39, 40, 53, 54, 56 etc.; and B. P. Sinha, The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha, p. 91.

has generally been restored with much plausibility as Toramāna. Mihirakula figures also in one inscription of king Yośodharman found at Mandasor which also refers to the Hūṇas. Another record of the same king found at the same place is dated in 533 A.D. So Mihirakula must have flourished in the first half of the sixth century A. D.

The grandiloquent inscriptions of Yaśodharman present him as a very great conqueror overrunning almost the whole of northern India. It is said "Spurning (the confinement of) the boundaries of his own house", he conquered even those countries which were not enjoyed by the Gupta Lords and which the command of the chiefs of the Hūṇas failed to penetrate", and further that to his feet bow down the chiefs "from the neighbourhood of the river Lauhitya upto the mountain Mahendra, and from Himalaya upto the Western Ocean." The only specific reference to any conquest is that over Mihirakula : "He (Yaśodharman), to whose feet respect was paid by even that (famous) king Mihirakula whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save (the god) Sthāṇu, (and) embraced by whose arms the Mountain of Snow falsely prides itself as being styled as inaccessible fortress." From these statements it has been generally adduced that Yaśodharman broke down the power of Mihirakula for ever. But this inference is not necessary. It appears that at the time of Yaśodharman the Hūṇas had already become the greatest power of the whole of northern India comparable only to the Guptas, who had ruled all over it only some time ago. The Hūṇa ruler Mihirakula was, of course, by far the most remarkable personality of this period to draw particular attention of the eulogy-writer of Yaśodharman. Yaśodharman might have defeated Mihirakula in some battle fighting alone or in alliance with some other rulers. But there is nothing to show that this defeat resulted in expulsion of Mihirakula from the Gangetic basin.

Mihirakula has left both silver and copper coins. His silver coins are of the Sassanian fabric only and indicate his sway over the Indus basin. The copper coins, found in the eastern Punjab as well as Rājasthāna and western U. P.,[1] show at the same time influence of both the Sassanian and Gupta prototypes. One class of them bears the usual Kushāṇa type. It has been suggested that this type was copied from the coins of the Kidāra Kushāṇas issued in Kashmir where they continued to maintain their hold after their expulsion from the Punjab by the Hūṇas. Mihirakula who is said to be the first[2] Hūṇa ruler to copy this coin-type, might be the earliest Hūṇa conqueror of this country. In some instances the types and inscriptions of Mihirakula have been struck over those of Toramāṇa.[3] Probably it shows that Toramāṇa was followed by Mihirakula.

Cosmas, an Alexandrine Greek, surnamed Indikapleustes (Indian Navigator), most probably visited India in the time of Mihirakula and wrote some account of his visits about which he has himself said, "All these matters I have described and explained partly from personal observation and partly from accurate enquiries which I have when in the neighbourhood of the different places." One passage in the 'Christian Topography' of this Navigator, which was probably begun in 533 A. D. but not put in its final form till 547 A. D., and about which the author has particularly made the above remark, gives the following information: "Higher up in India, that is, farther to the north, are the White Hūṇas. The one called Gollas, when going to war,

1. For his coins found near Mathurā see JNSI, VIII, 1947, pp. 30 ff.

2. Some coins of the Kushāṇa type bearing the legend 'tora' have been found in Kashmir (V. A. Smith, IMC, I, pp. 265 ff, Sec. XVII). But identification of this king with the Hūṇa ruler Toramāna has been doubted (Cunn., NC, 1894, p. 256; Rapson, Indian Coins, p. 30, para 106; A. S. Altekar, JNSI, XI, 1947, pp. 56 ff and others).

3. See Fleet, Ind. Ant., 1886, p. 245; and A S Altekar, JNSI, VIII, 1946, pp. 30-31.

takes with him, it is said, no fewer than two thousand elephants and a great force of cavalry. He is the Lord of India and oppressing the people forces them to pay tribute. A story goes that this king once upon a time would lay siege to an island city of the Indians which was on every side protected by water. A long while he sat down before it until with his elephants, his horses and his soldiers all the water had been drunk up. He then crossed over to the city dry-shod and took it."[1] After narrating something more about the Indians, the same writer remarks that "The river Phison separates all the countries of India from the country of the Huns", informing us elsewhere that the Phison is the same as the river Indus.

King Gollas, mentioned by Cosmas, has been identified with Mihirakula or Mihiragula not *only on the* basis of similarity of Gollas with the name ending gul but also for contemporaneity of time and sameness of Hūṇa race. Mihirakula *has been said by Cosmas to be the Lord of India* meaning most probably thereby the Indo-Gangetic basin or some part of it.

Yuan Chwang, the Chinese pilgrim who came to India (A. D. 629) not more than one hundred years after Mihirakula, gives a long account of this king in connection with the old city of Śākala. "Some centuries ago",[2] we are told, "there was a king called Mo-hi-lo-kiu-lo (Mihirakula) who established his authority in this town and ruled over India. He was of quick talent and naturally brave. He subdued all the neighbouring provinces without exception. In his intervals of leisure he desired to examine the Law of Buddha and he commanded *that one among the priests of superior* talent should wait on him. Now it happened that none of the priests dared to attend to his command...The priests

1. The Christian *Topography*, J. W. McCrindle's trans., p. 370.
2. Beal, Records, I, pp. 167 172.

put (an old servant in the king's household who had long worn the religious garments) forward in answer to the royal appeal. The king...then issued an edict to destroy all the priests through the five Indies, to overthrow the Law of Buddha, and leave nothing remaining.

"Bālāditya-rāja, king of Magadha, profoundly honoured the Law of Buddha and tenderly nourished his people. When he heard of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihirakula (Ta-tso) strictly guarded the frontiers of his kingdom and refused to pay tribute. Mihirakula raised an army to punish this rebellion. Bālāditya-rāja, knowing... "I cannot fight with them"...hid (with his followers) in islands of the sea.

"Mihirakula-rāja, committing the army to his younger brother, himself embarked on the sea to go to attack Bālāditya. The king guarding the narrow passes, whilst the light cavalry were out to provoke the enemy to fight, sounded the golden drum and his soldiers suddenly rose on every side and took Mihirakula alive as captive...

"At this time the mother of Bālāditya...hearing that they were going to kill Mihirakula...(got Bālāditya set him free)...

"Mihirakula-rāja's brother having gone back established himself in the kingdom. Mihirakula having lost his royal estate............going northwards to Kashmir, after some years............stirred up the people of the town to rebellion and killed the king of Kashmir and placed himself on the throne. Profitting by the victory and this renown it got him, he went to the west plotting againt the kingdom of Gandhāra. He set some soldiers in ambush and took and killed the king......Before the year was out he died."

Apart from the fact that Yuau Chwang has certainly made a mistake in placing Mihirakula 'some' centuries ago,

it is difficult to believe many details of his story. This is, however, clear that Mihirakula was known to the Chinese pilgrim less than only hundred years after his death as a great king. He dominated, no doubt, all the five Indies, that is, probably the whole of northern India. Once at least even the contemporary Gupta emperor has been said to have submitted to him and to have paid tribute to him. The story of Bālāditya's refuge in an 'island' on being attacked by Mihirakula reminds us of the latter's 'siege to an island city of the Indians which was on every side protected by water' told by Cosmas. Perhaps it refers to some fight between Mihirakula and the Gupta king Bālāditya who has been identified with one of the last Gupta emperors named Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya.[1] In the course of this fight most probably Mihirakula reached the moat around the Gupta capital. Whereas Cosmas, who is apparently much more reliable than religious-minded Yuan Chwang, informs us that the Hūṇa king was able to capture the city, the Buddhist pilgrim speaks of the king Bālāditya, who is known to be a patron of Buddhism,[2] as victorious. There is, however, little basis even on the prejudiced testimony of the Buddhist pilgrim to hold that king Bālāditya expelled the Hūṇas from the Gangetic valley *for good* as our historians have mostly inferred from his account. Yuan Chwang himself says that Mihirakula's kingdom remained intact under his brother.

It is indicated both by the Hūṇa coinage, and by the

1. Some other kings bearing this name are also known to us. In a Nālandā stone inscription (EI, XX, pp. 43-45) Bālāditya is described as a king of irresistible valour and vanquisher of all foes. Some kings of this name are mentioned also in a Sārnāth Inscription (Fleet, CII, p. 285). A Nālandā seal also (MASI, 66, p. 38) refers to a Gandhakuṭi of Sri Bālāditya. H. C. Raychoudhuri (PHAI, 6, p. 596) is inclined to identify Bālāditya with Bhānugupta of Eraṇ inscription.

2. Besides Yuan Chwang's testimony on this point for the Buddhistic leanings of Bālāditya, Paramārtha in his life of Vasubandhu relates that king Vikramāditya of Ayodhyā became a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu and sent his queen and the crown-prince Bālāditya to study under him. When Bālāditya came to the throne, we are told, he invited Vasubandhu to Ayodhyā (see JRAS, 1905, p. 49).

itinerary of Yuan Chwang that Mihirakula was in possession of Kashmir. Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī, which deals solely with the history of this country, gives a vivid, long description of Mihirakula as a great powerful conqueror, although it makes the mistake of putting the Hūṇa invader among the rulers of a native dynasty during whose reign Mlechchhas (probably the Hūṇas) are said to have attacked Kashmir. We are told that[1]: "Mihirakula, a man of violent acts and resembling Kāla (Death), ruled in the land which was overrun by the hordes of the Mlechchhas. In him the northern region brought forth, as it were, another god of death bent in rivalry to surpass the southern region which has Yama (as its guardian). The people knew his approach by noticing the vultures, crows and other (birds) which were flying ahead eager to feed on those who were being slain within his armies' reach. This royal Vetāl was day and night surrounded by thousands of murdered human beings even in his pleasure-houses. This terrible enemy of mankind had no pity for children, no compassion for women, no respect for the aged...He took delight in the cries of elephants falling from mountains". Furthermore Mihirakula is accredited with the conquests of not only Khasa country in the north lying in the Himalayas but also Lāṭa, Chola, Karṇāṭa and Siṁhala in the south. He is also said to have founded at Śrīnagarī the shrine of Maheśvara, to have established in Holada the large town called Mihirapura, to have bestowed agrahāras on 700 Brāhmaṇas of Gandhāra, and to have immolated himself in the flames after a rule of 70 years.

6. THE LATER HŪṆA RULERS

From the Aphsaḍ inscription of the Later Gupta king Ādityasena we learn that king Dāmodaragupta fought against the Maukharis headed by Īśānavarman who ruled

1. RāJ., Stein's ed., Vol. I, Ch. 1, Verses 180-321.

in 554 A.D. according to the Haraha inscription.[1] It is said that Dāmodaragupta broke up "the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukharis, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas (in order to trample them to death)".[2] From this reference to some battle between the Hūṇas and the Maukharis nearabout 550 A. D., it is clear that the Hūṇas continued to rule somewhere in the Gangetic valley by the side of the Maukharis whose inscriptions have come to light in the Jaunpur and Bārābankī districts of Uttar Pradesh. Contiguity of the Hūṇa dominions with the kingdom of Iśānavarman is indicated perhaps even by imitations of the Hūṇa coinage by the Maukharis. We do not know definitely the Hūṇa opponent of Iśānavarman or his immediate successor. It is not impossible that the Maukharis fought against the Hūṇas with the Gupta king Bālāditya. The name of the Gupta emperor in the Damodarpur plate of A. D. 543-44 is unfortunately lost otherwise we could have known the name of the Gupta emperor who is very likely to be a contemporary of Iśānavarman.

It is commonly supposed, though apparently without much justification, that after Mihirakula the Hūṇa sovereignty came to an end at least in the Gangetic basin. Recently, however, we have got some evidence for a few successors of Mihirakula in this region.

Two fragmentary seals[3] found at Nālandā give the genealogy of a ruler whose name is missing. On their basis Amalānand Ghosh[4] has framed the following order of succession of these kings whom he thinks to be Hūṇas :

(Mahārāja) Lavkhāna
|
(Mahārājādhirāja) name missing
Mahādevī Vittavvadevī
|
(Mahārāja) Jarīva
Mahādevī Melyādevī
|
(Mahārājādhirāja) name missing
|
Name missing
(author of the seal)

The first king known from the seals is Lavkhāna. He may be identified with Rājā Lakhāna Udayāditya[1] known from the Hūna coinage of India not only on the basis of similarity of the names but also on that of the sameness of palaeography of the seals and the coins. The Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] also mentions a ruler called Lakhana Narendrāditya in the second Gonanda dynasty. About him Stein[3] observes: "It appears very probable that by Lakhana Narendrāditya of the Rājataraṅginī is meant the same king who calls himself Lakhāna Udayāditya on the coins." The succession of the kings and queens as also their āditya titles undoubtedly do not agree. But probably this is due to minor mistakes in the Rājataraṅginī, which is notorious for such numerous lapses about other kings also.

The only other ruler known from the seals is Jarīva. He may be identified with another ruler known from a few coins of the Hūnas in India. The name of this king is found incompletely as Shāhi Jara... or Jari... on them.

The identification of both the known rulers from the Nālandā seals with two Hūṇa kings known from the coins

1. For the coins of this king as also for those of others detailed below, see Cunn., Later Indo-Scythians, pp. 97 ff. For Lavkhāna's coins, see also A. S. Altekar, JNSI, IX, 1947, pp. 14 ff.

2. Rāj., Stein's ed., III, 383.

3. Ibid., p. 106. Cf. p. 66 of Introd.

suggests that had we known the names of other kings of the seals, we would have been able to identify them also with other Hūna kings known from coins. One of the two missing names is likely to be Deva Shāhi Khiṅgila, known from some Hūṇa coins, who has been identified with Khinkhila Narendrāditya, one of the rulers of Kashmir mentioned by Kalhaṇa as closely following Mihirakula.[1]

It is noteworthy that from different types, imitating the Sassanian, Gupta and Kushāna coins, and from some other indications of general fabric of the coins of the above kings, it has been inferred that their issuers ruled over extensive territories embracing Kashmir and the upper Gangetic valley. The Āditya title of these kings copied from the Guptas shows not only their rule over some part of the Gangetic basin where the Guptas had ruled, but also that they came after Toramāna and Mihirakula who do not have such titles. *There may be some more Hūṇa kings who ruled* over this large empire. Their number, however, cannot be much more because it is known definitely that in the first half of the 7th century A. D. Harshavardhana occupied almost the whole of Gangetic basin. The Hūṇa kings must have sumbitted to him or they must have been ousted by him from this region.

Existence of the Hūna kingdom in some parts of north-western India even in the seventh century A. D., when Harshavardhana was ruling all over the Gangetic basin, is vouchsafed by the Harshacharita of Bāṇa. Speaking of Prabhākaravardhana, the father of Harsha (606-647 A. D.), Bāna uses six qualifying epithets for the king,[2] viz. "a lion to the *Hūna deer, a burning fever to the king of Sindhu, a troubler* of the sleep of Gurjar king, a bilious fever to that scent-elephant the lord of Gandhāra, destroyer of the skill of the Lāṭas, an axe to the creeper which is a *goddess of fortune (or*

1. Ibid., I, 347.
2. Harshacharita, Cowell's transl., p. 101.

sovereignty) of Mālavā." About the Hūnas we are told later that shortly before his death: Prabhākaravardhana sent a military expediton against them under his elder son Rājyavardhana to Uttarāpatha near the Himalayas. It appears that the Hūna kingdom of Bāna lay not far from the foothills of the Himalayas and we may locate it in the northern Punjab. The result of the compaigns of Rājyavardhana agaiast the Hūnas is not known. Most probably the Hūnas remained unsubdued as their defeat has not been mentioned.

It appears that on account of long occupation by the Hūnas, the Mālavā region came to be known at this time as the Hūna-Maṇḍala.[1]

Soon after the passing of Harshavardhana we find some of the dynasties, such as Gurjar Pratihāras, Chahamānas, Chandelas, Pālas, Senas and the like, ruling jointly over the whole of northern India. Until ousted by the Mohammedan invaders their rule lasted in some cases for several centuries. It has been suggested that these people were Hinduized Hūnas in origin.[2]

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGY

Chronology is the weakest point of ancient Indian history. But so far as the history dealt with in the foregoing pages is concerned, a series of dates all over it are known, at least approximately, with perfect certainty.

The dates of the Achaemenid emperors are known from the Persian as well as Classical records. Similarly the years and even the months of Alexander's activities in India are handed down to us by the historians who accompanied him, and are preserved in the writings of several Classical authors. Chandragupta Maurya, identified with Sandrokottos of the Classical literature, came on the throne soon after Alexander's departure from India in 325 B. C. His grandson Aśoka is definitely known to have lived in the middle of the third century B. C. by references to certain Greek kings of his time in his inscriptions. From Polybius we learn that the Indo-Greeks occupied India only after Antiochus III's invasian of Bactria about the end of the third century B.C.

THE INDO-PARTHIANS

The Indo-Greeks were followed by the Indo-Parthians who have left certain dated inscriptions of their time. Some dates known definitely from these inscriptions are the year 78 of Maues, the year 103 of Gondophernes, and the years 134 and 136 of 'Azes'. Generally these dates come from short records describing private foundations of common people. They seem to belong to one and the same era prevailing in noth-western India at this time.

On the basis of his coins Maues is unanimously thought to have lived in the middle of the second century B. C. We

do not know any era likely to be in use in north-western India at this time on referring to which his date 78 should give for him a date in the middle of the second century B.C. So the historians have proposed different hypothetical eras for him.[1] We are, however, inclined to think that, like the Iranian coin-types etc., the Parthian era was in use in this area at this time and the year 78 of Maues belongs to its second century with the digit for hundred omitted.[2] The above-mentioned dates of Gondophernes and 'Azes' may be attributed to the next century of the same era. They are generally referred to the so-called Vikrama era starting from 58 B. C. which might have originated in this way.[3]

THE ŚAKAS

The earliest date of the Śakas is found in a record of Śuḍāsa. It has been read as 72 or 42. On account of similarity of the coins of Śuḍāsa's father Rājūla with those of Azes II and Gondophernes, Śuḍāsa must be placed close to these Parthian kings. It means that his date should be referred to the era used in the records of these kings with the omission of hundred.

Chashṭana, who started the line of the Western Kshatrapas, probably went to Gujarāt-Surāshṭra from Mathurā much after Śuḍāsa. An inscription, in which with his grandson he is designated as the ruling sovereign, is dated 51. This year must be placed much after the year 72 or 42 of Śuḍāsa. If Chashṭana is identical with king Tiastanes of Ozene mentioned by Ptolemy, he should be placed in the beginning of the second century A. D. All this may mean that the era

of Chashṭana's record leaves one hundred more from the reckoning followed by Śuḍāsa. If so, this era started from about 52 A. D. Adopted by the followers of Chashṭana for several centuries, probably this very era came to be known as the Śaka era some five centuries after its beginning. Backward counting of the present Śaka era places its origin in 78 A.D. which is much far off from 53 A. D. But this difference of some 25 years might have somehow resulted in hundreds of years. Also the years from 42 to 46 in the inscriptions of the Khaharātas may be referred to Chashṭana's era.

THE KUSHĀṆAS

The year 122 of some Kushāṇa Mahārāja and the year 187 or 184 of Wima (?). are almost certainly dated in the so-called Vikrama era like the years of Gondophernes and 'Azes.'

The Kushāna rulers of Kanishka's group have left their records dated successively from the year 1 to the year 98. It is generally thought on this basis that Kanishka started a new era of his own and that these dates refer to that era. There is, however, absolutely no direct evidence for the fact that Kanishka started a new reckoning. Even the hyperbolic applause, bestowed upon this king so lavishly in several legendary works of Northern Buddhism, is remarkably conspicuous by complete absence of any reference to this point. The kings of ancient India do not appear to have taken any glory in starting new eras at least upto the time of Kanishka. Even the most important of them, whose boastful eulogies too have passed down to us, have dated their records in their regnal years. Moreover, the earliest records of Kanishka, dated in the first, second and third years of his reign, were caused to be engraved by lay religious-minded people of far off places who could hardly know of the beginning of a new era so soon after its start.

They refer to the era used by them as the usual reckoning.[1] So it seems to us that the years of the Kushāṇa kings of Kanishka's group are dated in the same era with hundreds omitted which had been used by the earlier Kushāṇa kings of Kadphises group namely, the so-called Vikrama era with two hundreds omitted. It will give the starting point of the dates of the later group of the Kushāṇa kings as 144 A. D.[2]

The date of Kanishka has been perhaps the most controversial point in entire ancient Indian history. At present the conventional view makes Kanishka start the Śaka era of 78 A. D. from the time of his coronation, although a band of eminent scholars would like to put Kanishka about the middle of the second century A. D.[3] In our opinion the following points clinch a date about 140 A. D. for Kanishka :

(1) There is little cogent ground to doubt the reference of years 136 of Azes, 187 of Khalatse inscription, and 191 of Jihoṇika to the so-called Vikrama era which is generally applied to other records of this period. Now referred to this era, the year 136 of 'Azes' comes to be 79 A. D. making it impossible for Kanishka to start the Śaka era of 78 A. D. The suggestion that the Kushāṇa king mentioned in the record of 'Azes' might be Kanishka is wholly untenable because the stratum on which the records of 'Azes' have been found is much earlier than the time of Kanishka as indicated by the

coins found on it. The inscriptions of Khalatse and Jihonika, attributed respectively to 130 and 134 A.D., suggest a date after these years for Kanishka. Stratigraphically at least one of these, Jihonika, is known to have come before Kanishka.

(2) The Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudragupta of about 350 A. D. refers to a 'Devaputra Shāhi Shāhānushāhi', apparently an imperial Kushāṇa ruler. It shows that upto this time at least the memory of the Kanishka dynasty lingered on. But reference of the dates of Kanishka group to the era of 78 A.D. brings the end of its rule at the latest before 250 A.D., that is, some one hundred years before Samudragupta. This date for the end of its rule makes it, of course, too early to be mentioned by Samudragupta. If we put the latest known ruler of Kanishka group with imperial titles about 300 A. D., Kanishka comes to rule c. 150 A. D.

(3) From the Kushâno-Sassanian coins it is clear that the Oxus region passed from the Kushāna empire to the Sassanian rule about the middle of the third century A. D. Now it is known for certain that it was Vāsudeva I who lost this region for his successors appear to have no control over it as known from the distribution of their coins. Then Vāsudeva I must be put about this time making Kanishka to rule c. 150 A.D.

(4) A reference in the Chinese literature points out to the existence of the Kushāṇa empire from the Oxus valley to India in the middle of the third century A. D. As after Vāsudeva I the Oxus region slipped out of the Kushāna dominions, this reference must be meant at the latest for the Kushāna empire of Vāsudeva I. Now if Vāsudeva I was ruling about 250 A. D., Kanishka cannot be placed earlier than the second century A. D.

(5) The Chinese historian, Fan-ye, having knowledge of the events upto 125 A. D., traces the history of the Kushāṇa dynasty only upto Wima Kadphises, and is not

at all aware of Kanishka and his successors. Lohuizen[1] has tried to disparage the authenticity of this historian by pointing out that he has referred even to the events of 159 and 161 A. D. But we think that a few lapses can hardly justify rejection of a general approach.

The year 41 of Kanishka II of the Ārā inscription has been variously explained by our historians. But it looks most plausible to us that Kanishka II ruled after Vāsudeva I as is inferable from coins also, and that the year 41 of this king, which must be put after the year 98 of Vāsudeva, belongs to the century next to that of all other known dates of the Kushāna kings of Kanishka's group. It is really the year 141 of the records of the kings of this group.

THE SUCCESSORS OF THE KUSHĀṆAS

Among the successors of the Kushāṇas the dates of the Sassanians are known definitely by the coins, inscriptions and historical works.

The dates of the other rulers of this period namely, the Shākas, the Gaḍaharas, the Kidāras etc. are not known definitely and accurately. They have been referred to this time only on the basis of the similarities of their coin-types with the issues of contemporary dynasties.

The Magha records give dates of an era ranging from 51 to 139 which is still a riddle for our historians. While referred to the Śaka era these dates make the Maghas contemporary of the Kushāṇa emperors, attributed to the Gupta era they place them in the time of Imperial Guptas. It seems better to assign these dates to the Kanishka era with one hundred omitted.

The year 1 of the Eran inscription of Toramāṇa, and 16 of an inscription of Mihirakula appear to be in the Gupta era with two hundreds omitted.

1. SP., pp. 369-70.

(C) JAIN

Brown W N	The Story of Kalaka, Washington, 1933

2 NON-INDIAN LITERATURE

(A) GRAECO ROMAN

Apollonius	Philostratus, The Life of Appollonius of Tyana, with an English trans by P. E Conybeare, Vol I, London, 1927.
Arrian, Anabasis and Indica	Anabasis, Eng trans by McCrindle, Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, Westminster, 2nd ed , 1896 Indica, Eng trans by McCrindle, Ancient India as Described by Megas thenes and Arrian, Calcutta, Bombay, London, 1877.
Ctesias, Eragments of the Persica and of the Indica	Eng trans in McCrindle's Ancient India as described by Ktesias the Knidian, Calcutta, Bombay, London, 1882
Isidore of Charax, Mansiones Practical Geographi Graeci Minores	Ed and trans by W H Schoff, Parthian Stations of Isidore of Charax, Philadelphia, 1914
Megasthenes Fragments of Indica	Eng trans by McCrindle Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian, Calcutta, Bombay, London, 1877.
Periplus Maris Erythraean	Eng trans , The Commerce and Navigation of the Erythraean Sea etc by J W McCrindle, Calcutta, Bombay, London 1879 Eng trans by W H Schoff, The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea and annotations London, '912
Pliny Naturalis Historia	Ed D Detlefsen, Berlin, 1866-73
Ptolemy, Geographica	Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy, ed by S N Majumdar, Calcutta, 1927

Tabari — Frenth trans. of H. Zotenberg, tome II, Paris, 1869 and Noldeke, Ch., Geschichte der perser und uraber Zu-eit der Sassaniden, Leyden, 1879.

Mirkhond — Trans. by E. Reeatsek, The Raudatus-safa or Garden of Purity, pt. 1, 2 Vols, London, 1892.

II. ORIGINAL SOURCES: ARCHAEOLOGICAL

1. INSCRIPTIONS

Barua B. M. — Old Brāhmī Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri Caves, Calcutta, 1929.

Aśoka and His Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1946.

Epigraphica Indica — et passim.

Fleet, J. F. — Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III, Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and Their Successors, Calcutta, 1888.

Herzfeld, E. — Paikuli : Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sassanian Empire, 2 Vols., Texts and Plates, Berlin, 1924.

Hultzsch, E. — Inscriptions of Asoka, New Ed., CII, Vol. I, London, 1925.

Kent, G. — Old Persian, Chicago, 1950.

Konow, Sten — Kharoshṭhī Inscriptions with the exception of those of Asoka, CII, Vol. II, Part I, London, 1929.

Luders. — Hist. of Brāhmī Inscriptions upto 400 A. D. in EI, Vol. X.

2. COINS

Allan, J. — Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum, London, 1936.

Banerji, R. D. — Notes on Indo-Scythian Coinage, JASB, New Series, Vol. IV, 1908, pp. 81-93.

Bivar, A. D. R. — The Kunduz Hoard, JNSI, XVII, 1955, pp. 37 ff.

Cunningham, A. — Coins of Alexander's in the East, the Greeks and Indo-Scythians, Part I, The Greeks of Bactriana, Ariana and India, London, 1869.

Coins of Ancient India from the earliest times down to the seventh century A. D., London, 1891.

Coins of the Indo-Scythians, Rep. Num. Chron., London, 1882-92.

Later Indo-Scythians, Rep. Num. Chron., London, 1893-95.

Gardner, Percy — *The Coins of the Greeks and Scythic* Kings of Bactria and India, London, 1886.

Herzfeld, E. — Kushāno-Sassanian Coins, MASI, Calcutta, *1930*; also *MASI, Nos. 59, 62.*

Jenkins, G. K. — Mint Marks on Saka-Pahlava Coins, JNSI, XVII, 1955, pp. 1 ff.

Journal of the Numismatic Society of India — et passim.

Martin, M. F. C. — JASBL, III, Num. Supp., XLVII, pp. 23-50.

Newell, E. T. — The Coinage of the Eastern Seleucid Mints, New York, 1941.

Numismatic Chronicle — et passim.

Paruck, F. D. J. — Sassanian Coins, Bombay, 1924.

Rapson E. J. — Indian Coins, Strassburg, 1897; Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, *the Western Kshatrapas, the* Traikuṭaka dynasty and the Bodhi dynasty (Cat. of Ind. Coins in the British Museum, Vol. IV), London 1903.

Smith, V. A. — Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the Cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. I, Oxford, 1906.

Whitehead, R. B. — Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum, Lahore, Vol. I, Indo-Greek Coins, Oxford, 1914.

Worth, W. — Coins of Parthia, BMC, 1903.

III. MODERN WORKS

Altekar, A. S. and Majumdar, R. C. — A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI.

Bachhofer, L. — On Greeks and Śakas in India, JAOS, Vol. 61, 1941, pp. 223-250.

Bevan — House of the Seleucus, London, 1902.

Buhler, G. — Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS made in Kashmir, Rajputana and Central India, Bombay 1877.

Bury, J. B. — A History of Greece, London, 1929.

Chattopadhyaya, S. — The Achaemenids in India, IHQ, 1949 and *1950.*

History of India c. 200 B. C. to 600 A.D., 1960.

Chavannes, E. — Toung Pao et passim.

Debevoise, N. C. — A Political History of Parthia, Chicago, 1938.

Franke, O. — Beitrage aus Chinesischen Quellen Zu Kennthis der Turkvolker und Shythen Centrallzien, Berlin, 1904.

Ghirshman, R. — Begram, Researches Archàeologiques et historiques sur les Kouchans, Memoires de la Delegation Archaeologique fraacaiseen Afghanistan, tome XII, le Cairo, 1946.

Les Chionites-Hephthalites, 1948.

Iran, 1958.

Holdich, T. H. — The Gates of India, London, 1910.

India, London, 1905.

Jean Filliozat — Political History of India, 1957.

Karlgren — Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese, Paris, 1923.

Keilhorn, F. — Examination of Questions connected with the Vikrama Era, Ind. Ant., Vol. 20, 1891, pp. 124-142 and 397-414.

On the Dates of the Śaka Era in inscriptions, Ind. Ant., Vol. 26, 1896, pp. 146-153.

Lohuizen De Leeuw. — The "Scythian" Period, Leiden, 1949.

McGovern, W. M. — The Early Empires of Central Asia, A Study of the Scythians and the Huns and the part they played in world's History, Chapel *Hill*, 1939.

Majumdar, R. C. — History and Culture of the Indian People, Vols. I-III, Bombay, 1951 onwards.

Marquart, J. — Eransahr, Berlin, 1901.

Marshall, J. H. — Taxila, 3 Vols, 1951.

Mukerji, R. K. — Chandragupta Maurya and His Times, Madras, 1943.

Narain, A. K. — The Indo-Greeks, Oxford, 1957.

Olmstead, A. T. — History of Persian Empire, Chicago, 1930.

Otto Maenchen-Helfen — The Yueh-chi Problem Re-examined, JAOS, 1945, pp. 71-81.

Panikkar, K. M. — Geographical Factors in Indian History, Bombay, 1950.

Pargiter, F. E. — *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of* the Kali Age, Oxford, 1913.

Pauly Wissowa — Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenchaft.

Puri, B. N. — The Kushāṇas in India, 1965.

Rapson, E. J. — Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Cambridge, 1922.

Rawlinson, H. G. — *Intercoure Between India and the* Western World, Cambridge, 1916.

Raychaudhuri, H. C. — Political History of Ancient India, 6th ed., Calcutta, 1953.

Age of the Nandas and Mauryas, Benares, 1952.

Rhys Davids — Buddhist India, London, 1903.

Richards, J. F. — Geographic Factors in Indian Archaeology, IA, 1933.

Sankalia, H. D. — Prehistory and Proto-History of India, 1963.

Satyashrava — The Śakas in India, Lahore, 1947.

Smith, V. A. — Early History of India, 4th ed., Oxford, 1924.
— Asoka, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1920.
The Oxford History of India, Oxford, 1919.
— The Indo-Parthian Dynasties from about 120 B. C.—100 A. D., ZDMG, Vol. 61, 1907, pp. 403-421.

Spate, C. H. K. India and Pakistan, London, 1954.

Sykes, P. A History of Afghanistan, 1940.

Tarn, W. W. The Greeks in Bactria and India, Cambridge, 1938.
Alexander the Great, 2 Vols., Cambridge, 1951.

Thapar, Romila Ashoka and the Decline of the Mauryan Empire, London, 1960.

Thomas, F. W. Sakastana, Where dwelt the Sakas named by Darius and Herodotus ?, JRAS, 1906, pp. 182-200 and 460-64.

—Tripathi, R. S. Hitory of Kanauj, Benares, 1937.

Vallee Poussin, L. de la L'Inde aux tems des Mauryae et des Barbares, Greece Scythese, Parthese et Yue-tchi, L'Historie du Monde, tome VII.

Venkatachar, C. S. Geographical Realities of India, 1955.

Warmington, E. H. The Commerce Between the Roman Empire and India, Cambridge, 1928.

— Wheeler, R E M. Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers London, 1954.
— Early India and Pakistan, Bombay, 1960.

Woodcock, George The Indo-Greeks, 1966.

Wylie, A. Notes on the Western Regions, J. Anthro. Inst., 1880.

INDEX